

The Rambler,

A CATHOLIC JOURNAL AND REVIEW.

VOL. VI.

NOVEMBER 1850.

PART XXXV.

RELIGION AND MODERN PHILOSOPHY.

No. III.

THE MOSAIC COSMOGONY COMPARED WITH THE DEDUCTIONS OF SCIENCE.

WE can easily imagine that our interpretation of the passages we have quoted from the books of Moses, and of Job more especially, will seem to many persons to be a straining of words adapted to fit into a preconceived theory; or at least an adoption of a system which would fix *any* meaning on Holy Scripture. To this we reply, first, that the parallelism drawn between the account of Moses and that of the 38th chapter of Job does not at all affect our main argument. It is quite possible that the object of Genesis may be to describe the creation, and that of Job merely to paint the wonders of nature, without following the chronological order of their formation.* Yet, after all, our interpretation of the passages

* Our view of the destruction of a primitive order of the universe in consequence of the fall of the angels was adopted in the last paper partly as appearing more consistent with the doctrine of St. Thomas Aquinas (Sum. i. q. lxi. art. 3), but mainly as harmonising with the assumption of this parallelism between Genesis and Job. It is a view that is quite foreign to any scientific inquiry, and we should not have introduced it in our last paper unless it had been required to explain the first eleven verses of Job xxxviii., which appear (on our assumption) to describe the state of the universe prior to the creation of light as it is at present. In a strictly scientific inquiry, however, we have nothing to do with any such views. The earliest fact of which science can possibly inform us is the amorphous state of matter immediately preceding its present formation. In our present paper, therefore, we shall say nothing about any prior states of the universe, except in reference to the alleged improbability of God's creating a chaos. "In the beginning," says Father Pianciani, "matter was in the simplest possible state, without any of those relations which afterwards formed compound substances or homogeneous masses. I suppose, then, that the atoms of simple substances were disseminated in space, independent of one another, but disposed to obey the physical and chemical laws imposed on them by the Creator. It was in some sense a chaos, but not such as Ovid describes: *Non bene junctarum*

from Job is not more forced or distorted than the explanation of an enigmatical and symbolical writing must necessarily appear. For instance, however like a paradox it may seem to maintain, that in 22-30 it is not the natural phenomenon of hail and snow, but the work of the third day, that is described; yet after the name of *water* is once appropriated to matter in its fluid state, how could we describe more naturally the aggregation and solidification of this matter, than by the parallel phenomena of the formation of rain and ice from vapour and water? We do not deny that this well-known phenomenon is the first and most obvious meaning of the passage. But in Scripture there is often a double intention. The history of Joseph, of David, or of Solomon, is related, but with a special reference to our Blessed Lord. A spiritual promise is conveyed in a temporal covering; the day of judgment is described in terms of the destruction of Jerusalem. Why, then, may not the same thing take place in the scientific parts of Scripture? Natural phenomena present as striking analogies with each other as historical events, and the greater may be described in terms of the less, here as well as in the prophetic portions of the sacred volume.

There is no doubt that this typical interpretation of Scripture may be carried too far; but still we must not conclude that all interpretations which at first sight appear far-fetched and distorted are really so. It is quite possible that there should be what are called far-fetched analogies in Scripture; indeed, the necessary obscurity of language when applied to the higher subjects of thought renders it highly probable that there are.

To apply these remarks to the passages under consideration; let us attempt to put the descriptions of Moses and Job into language more scientifically precise, but equally concise, and we shall find that we have perhaps used terms more current and intelligible to the *present* generation, but still *originally* quite as uncertain and obscure. "In the beginning God created heaven and earth," that is, in modern language, *spirit* and *matter*; in Greek it would be *πνεῦμα καὶ ὕλη*, *breath* and *timber*. Surely there is more real propriety in the Hebrew analogy than in the more modern Greek and Latin choice of terms. We have already remarked the similarity between the prophetic and the scientific language of Scripture; now

discordia semina rerum. In matter, as created by the Sovereign Wisdom, disorder could only be apparent, and pregnant with a marvellous order. The atoms were created in such number, measure, and proportion, as would in the sequel cause them to conjoin and form all that they have since formed, and all that they are to form hereafter."—*Memoir read before the Academy of Sciences at Bologna, Dec. 1817.*

every one knows the obscurity and difficulty of the former. Sir Isaac Newton himself dabbled a little in the interpretation of prophecy;* and in his wish to reduce it to a scientific system, has given us a specimen of a prophetic glossary, in which he informs us, among other matters, that the sun and moon are kings and queens; the moon is the body of the people considered as the king's wife; stars are princes or rulers; new moons, the returning of a dispersed people into a body politic; a furnace, a state of slavery; riding on clouds, reigning over much people, &c. We must also take into account the genius of primitive language and of the old Eastern nations, how it delighted in riddles and dark sayings, and placed its wisdom in "considering a parable and its interpretation, the words of the wise and their enigmas."† Yet these strings of tangled argument may be all unravelled, and the most far-fetched analogies reduced to scientific accuracy, for they were not empty words, but the representatives of real ideas in the mind.

"All that is highest of every species," says F. Schlegel, "can only be apprehended as it is at the same time both logical and symbolical."‡ It appears to us, that our interpretation of Moses results naturally from a strict application of this principle; we first determined the meaning of the symbolical term, either from the definition of the writer himself, or from traditional interpretation; and then we strictly adhered to this meaning of the word, till either the author gave a new definition, or manifestly used the word in a new sense. For instance, the *heaven* of the first verse is evidently something different from the heaven of the eighth verse, which is an after-formation. The *earth* of the first and second verses is also something very different from the *earth* of the tenth verse, where we are told that God applied the old name to a new phenomenon. So, again, the word *day*, where it first occurs in the fifth verse, is defined to mean *light*: "God called the light, day;" it has no reference to time here. The first place where it can be taken in its present sense of a period of time is in verse fourteen, where God makes the sun and moon to be for seasons, and *days*, and years. It is superfluous to say, that there could have been no ordinary *day* before the existence of the sun. We have, therefore, no warrant to take the word where it occurs in the fifth verse, "the evening and morning were one day," and in the similar passages, in a sense that has reference to any measured time whatever. If it means period or epoch at all, it can only be in the unlimited

* Observations on Daniel.

† Prov. i. 6.

‡ Philosophy of Language, lect. vi.

sense of the old word *æon*, or age. We say *unlimited*; for if the introduction of the seventh day put a limit or period to the work of God, it would not be true that God *worketh till now*. God has not ceased working; the day of rest has not put a period to the agencies of any of the preceding days; all these days have dawned from night to morning, from non-existence into existence, but as yet they have had no setting. A *day*, understood as a period of time, however long, must have a limit; the second day cannot begin till the first is completed. But Moses never hints at the completion of any one of his periods. After the creation of man, the agency of the third day was still in active operation, giving birth to new and beautiful forms of vegetable life. "God had planted a paradise . . . in which He placed man . . . and God produced out of the soil every tree beautiful to the sight, and sweet to the taste."* Even still, perhaps, "in the light-illuminated realms of space, myriads of worlds are bursting into life, like the grass of the night."† Therefore we conclude that the Mosaic days are not periods of time.‡

If, then, the days of Genesis do not mean epochs or periods of time, it is most reasonable to accept the meaning which Moses himself suggests, when he says: "God called the light, day." The *light*, that is, the great motive power, the great agent in the formation and organisation of the universe. Take the word, therefore, in the sense of agency, law, or principle of formation, and all becomes clear. The first, or rather the one cardinal day, was the agency of light, the introduction of the principle of motion and life into chaotic matter. The second day is the development of the repulsive forces of matter. The third is the manifestation of the power of gravitation, cohesion, chemical affinity, resulting in vegetable organisation. The fourth, the concentration of the solar atmosphere, and development of the powers of direct and reflected light. The fifth and sixth, the development of animal life in its various stages. The seventh, the principle of stability. If the *days* are to be understood in this sense, and not as chronological periods, evidently it need not be supposed that the work of one day was ended before that of another began; all the agencies might be going on at once. Might not the first motion of the spirit of God on the face of the abyss, the first vibration in the extreme limits of matter, have commenced ages and ages before the production of light? Might not this

* Gen. ii. 8, 9.

† Cosmos, p. 145.

‡ "Moses uses the word *day* solely to determine the order of succession of creation, without wishing to express any portion of time whatever."—*Le Baron d'Alvimarc's Refutations*, p. 50, note.

vibration have been at first slow, gradually giving rise to various phenomena, such as motion, repulsion, attraction, heat, electricity, &c. before light appeared? May not all these phenomena depend on distinct vibrations going on simultaneously in the æther, in the same way as in the atmosphere the distinct vibrations of many different sounds, besides those that may be either too slow or too rapid to make any impression on the human ear, may all be going on at once? Perhaps at the first dawn of the vibration of the "extremities of matter," which was at last to produce light, the universe at once waked up, the vapour* began to divide, firmaments or clear fields of æther were interposed between the masses, the process of solidification commenced, and the solids were even clothed with cellular organisms, before light existed in its present state of perfection. For it is well known that light itself is divisible, and that some of the coloured rays result from vibrations considerably slower than others. It is evident also that, if the formation of the firmament was an agency by which the fields of æther were cleared of grosser cosmical vapour, this process could not go on without a corresponding action in the vapour itself, namely, a gathering together of the fluid masses, and their gradual condensation and solidification; thus the work of the second and third days must have been contemporaneous, the latter being but the natural result of the former. Thus also, as we have seen, the waters had produced their fish and birds, and the earth its mammalia, before the vegetable creation was brought to perfection; that is to say, we have no right to look for distinct epochs of vegetable life, of fishes and birds, and of mammalia. The use of the word *day* is merely a mode of representing the *physical succession* of the agencies. The same method is adopted by the man of science when he divides the phenomena of nature into branches of study, and calls them chemistry, mechanical philosophy, natural history. Nature has no such divisions; her laws proceed in exquisite order, unity, and beauty, independently of the artificial mode in which man observes them. Dante furnishes us with another example of the same figure. In the fourth canto of his *Paradiso* he makes Beatrice explain, that although the different orders of

* We are enabled by the kindness of a friend to give the following great authorities for this interpretation of the primitive *waters*. "St. Gregory of Nyssa says, that the water mentioned here is of a different nature from ordinary water, which tends to flow downwards. St. Augustine writes, that the formless earth, called a dark abyss, is here not unreasonably called *water*, because it was softer and more fluid than the earth; and that we ought not here to understand the common water that we see and touch (*De Gen. cont. Manich.* l. i.). St. Ephrem thinks that the water did not exist even in germ after the first creation, nor even on the first day of the detailed creation."—*Father Pianciani's Memoir*, p. 14.

blessed spirits were exhibited to him in different spheres, the lowest in that of the moon, the next in that of Mercury, and so on, this was only an adaptation to his faculties, to give him a sensible proof of the real difference in their condition ; for, in reality, all these spirits, from the Blessed Virgin to the last of the penitents, inhabited the same empyrean. "The highest Seraphim, Moses, Samuel, John, the Blessed Virgin herself, have not their thrones in any heaven distinct from that inhabited by the spirits you have just now seen (in the moon), but all together inhabit the empyrean, where they enjoy different grades of glory. Here were they shewn thee, not because this is their proper sphere, but to give you a sensible indication of their different ranks. It is necessary to speak thus to your capacities, which draw from sensible objects the impressions on which the intellect ponders." Thus also the creation, to which no conception of measured time is really applicable, is exhibited to us as taking place in six *days*, a word that, in spite of definitions, *will* convey some idea of time, simply as being the most intelligible way of representing it.

The word *day*, then, cannot be taken literally to represent an epoch of time ; the only way it can signify time at all is in the sense of succession ; not so much, however, the succession of time, but of cause and effect—physical succession. The first agency, or day, was physically, causally, and logically the first in operation, was necessary in order to make the second agency possible, according to the laws which the Creator had laid down ; yet perhaps no appreciable period of time intervened between the introduction of the first and the second agencies or days. The succession of the six days denotes the physical dependence of the agencies one on another, all derived from the first, in the order set forth by Moses. We must not imagine them to be periods in which one agency was exclusively in operation, nor that when one period finished another began, as is the case in chronological days or periods. In point of succession, then, days are not to be arranged in one line, divided into six parts, but in five branches from one root, any one of which may be indefinitely protracted without interfering with the commencement of another. In this way we may see that Moses may speak of the *day** of creation, it being in one sense as true to attribute it to one day or agency, as in another to six. It is a day like that of Isaias, one day containing the virtue of seven days, when "the light of the sun is sevenfold, as the light of seven days."†

* Gen. ii. 4.

† The following is a very remarkable authority for the view here maintained. At the Council of Treves, A.D. 1148, the works of St. Hildegard were solemnly read and approved before Pope Eugenius III. and St. Bernard. In her *Liter-*

We have endeavoured to follow out the same strict rules of reasoning in assigning the meaning of the other scientific terms of Moses, such as the *waters*, the *spirit*, the *firmament*, the *dry* (land), &c., but with what success we cannot pretend to determine, because, as we proved before, we can never expect to come to the certain understanding of the scientific passages of Scripture, till the sciences themselves are sufficiently advanced to enable us to explain them. Modern sceptics will, of course, insist on our admitting the traditional meaning of these passages, and on our standing or falling by the sense which past ages attached to them;—a proceeding in all respects similar to the absurdity which the Jews committed when they insisted that the ancient predictions respecting the Messiah should be fulfilled precisely in the way that their doctors had imagined, and which had become familiar to the hopes of the whole people, namely, that the Christ should come as a temporal deliverer from foreign dominion, and as the restorer of the old historical glory of Solomon. “Let these prophecies be fulfilled in this way,” said they, “or we will not believe.” But the prophecy was fulfilled, and fulfilled literally, but in a way most contrary to their expectations. The predictions were purposely uttered in a way that could not be generally understood till they were illuminated by the event; so the scientific anticipations in Genesis cannot be entirely and certainly understood till science has by itself explored the great mass of the phenomena of the universe.

We have, then, in our possession a document claiming to be divine, and as a sign of its inspiration, giving us in enigmatical language a description of the formation of the universe, written in the primitive ages of the world, when science was in its infancy, when, as Humboldt says, “the Cosmos was dimly shadowed forth to the human mind;”^{*} and which must therefore either be the result of inspiration, or else, as Humboldt would have us believe, a mere guess, a natural process of the human mind, resulting from its very structure,—“the result of an identity in the mode of intellectual conception, which has every where led man to adopt the same conclusion regarding identical phenomena.”[†] But what is the fact? Moses gives us a number of minute details (such as

Epistolarum, p. 208, occurs the following answer to the question: How is it that God created all things at once (*creavit omnia simul*, Eccl. xviii. 1), when Genesis says that He created them in six days? *Sex dies sex opera sunt; quia inceptio et completio singuli cujusque operis dies dicitur*. After the creation of the *materia prima*, the spirit of God was borne upon the waters, and at the same moment, without any interval, God said, Let light be made. See Ratisbonne's *Life of St. Bernard*, chap. xli.

^{*} Cosmos, p. 2.

[†] *Ib.* p. 365.

the primitive vaporous form of matter, the universal agency of light, the order of the formation of fishes, birds, mammalia, and last of all, man), which may be conceived to have taken place in a thousand different ways, on which, in matter of fact, there is no identity in the mode of conception; and which cannot be a guess, because they are too minute and detailed to allow us to consider them to be right only by chance. If science confirms the account of Moses, nothing will be left for us but to allow it to have been supernaturally revealed; and we must acknowledge that it stands with good reason at the head of the book of Almighty God's revelations, and is a sign of the supernatural knowledge of the human writer.

Nor must we complain that this description is so enigmatical as to have been hitherto unintelligible. If it had been plainer, it would have been either a great difficulty to philosophers in past ages, as being plainly opposed to all their notions of science; or if it had moulded science, the present theory of cosmogony would have come down to us as a tradition, and it would have been impossible to say whether Moses originated it, or whether he merely wrote it down, as wishing to render his book the expression of popular opinion. Thus the whole evidence which it now gives for the inspiration of Moses would have been lost.

And here we may say a word on the hypothesis which has been so well received among many biblical scholars, that the beginning of Moses has been blended, has grown or been interwoven from two documents, an Elohim document and a Jehovah document,—an hypothesis which Schlegel calls “a remarkable monument of critical error in our century.” No doubt a fresh beginning is made by Moses at the fourth verse of the second chapter of Genesis; but the two accounts are by no means opposed; the first chapter and the first three verses of the second contain an account of the Genesis, which we may fairly regard as a sign of inspiration to men of late ages when knowledge shall have increased; and therefore in that part he tells us nothing but what science has been, or will in time be, able to confirm. Then he proceeds to narrate facts and events which no science can ever discover, and which we must always accept on faith,—paradise, the tree of knowledge, the formation of Eve from the side of Adam, the serpent tempter, the fall of man and original sin, and the promise of a Redeemer the seed of a woman.

But it may be objected, How can the history of the formation of the universe be used as a sign of inspiration? how can its correctness be tested? Our senses, aided by instruments, enable us to describe the universe as it at present

exists, but what materials have we to enable us to trace its variations during the course of ages?

We may answer this question in the words of Humboldt: "The very aspect of Nature records its history; . . . the changes that sometimes occur in the starry heavens belong, with reference to their historical reality, to other periods of time than those in which, by the phenomena of light, they are first revealed to us; they reach us like the voices of the past. . . . The elder Herschel was of opinion that light required almost two millions of years to pass to the earth from the remotest luminous vapour reached by his telescope. . . . The aspect of the starry heavens presents us with that which is only apparently simultaneous."* "As in our forests we see the same kind of tree in all the various stages of growth, and are thus enabled to form an idea of its progressive vital development, so do we also, in the great garden of the universe, recognise the most different phases of sidereal formation."† And then, to descend from the heavens to our globe: "If we would correctly comprehend Nature, we must not absolutely separate the consideration of the present state of things from that of the successive phases through which they have passed. We cannot form a just conception of their nature without looking back on the mode of their formation . . . the globe reveals to us at every phase of its existence the mystery of its former conditions. We cannot survey the crust of our planet without recognising the traces of the prior existence and destruction of an organic world. The sedimentary rocks present a succession of organic forms, associated in groups which have successively displaced and succeeded each other. The different superimposed strata thus display to us the vegetable and animal kingdoms of different epochs. In this sense the description of Nature is intimately connected with its history."‡ It follows, then, that in proportion as Nature becomes known, the Mosaic account of the Genesis may be subjected to the test of science. Let us examine it from this point of view.

The first fact which Moses relates is the void, unsubstantial, amorphous form of matter. This, too, is the foundation of the nebular hypothesis of Laplace, which seems now to be universally accepted. All the solid bodies in the universe are considered to be formed by the condensation and agglomeration of the cosmical vapour.§

His next fact is the motion of the "spirit on the waters," implying the existence of an æther having the same relative proportion to the cosmical vapour as our atmosphere bears to

* Cosmos, p. 144.

† Ib. p. 67.

‡ Ib. p. 54.

§ Ib. p. 67, *et passim*.

the water. Accordingly Humboldt tells us, that "besides the luminous clouds and nebulae, exact observations indicate the existence and general distribution of an apparently non-luminous infinitely divided matter, possessing a force of resistance. . . . Of this impeding, ætherial, and cosmical matter, it may be supposed that *it is in motion*; that it gravitates," &c.*

His third fact is the commencement of the *organic formation* of the universe, the first agency in reducing matter from a dark amorphous state into order and vitality; it is the production of light. And Humboldt tells us that "the world of phenomena, and that which constitutes its causal reality, is dependent on the propagation of light."† "The light of remote heavenly bodies presents us with the most ancient perceptible evidence of the existence of matter." Moses tells us that light was created before the sun; and though this was made a subject of infinite ridicule by Voltaire and his clique of philosophers, yet Humboldt tells us that the vapour of which the sun, as well as all other cosmical bodies, has been formed is *self-luminous*.‡ It was luminous while yet scattered in the form of vapour, before it was agglomerated into its present state.

The next fact of Moses is the division of this vapour into masses by firmaments, or fixed chasms; and, in matter of fact, "the cosmical vapour is dispersed in definite nebulous spots."§ All space is filled with matter of some kind, varying in density from the most solid spheres to the most attenuated æther; and even still "the process of condensation is going on before our eyes."|| We are forced, then, to carry our minds back to a period when all space was filled with amorphous undivided matter; and, next to the production of light, we are forced to conclude that the most ancient cosmical fact is an agency by which the division of this equally distributed vapour into definite masses was effected. This division is distinguished by Moses from condensation and agglomeration, which he attributes to the next agency; we therefore only follow the path he has indicated in attributing it to the agency of *repulsive forces*. And here modern philosophy¶ (which imagines every primary molecule of matter to be surrounded with three consecutive strata or atmospheres of antagonistic forces, the innermost being an enormous force of repulsion; around this a stratum of attractive force; and last of all, an outside stratum of repulsion); must needs agree with Moses, that whether the first motion of the molecules of matter commenced from within or from without, the first force manifested must be one of repulsion. In the 38th chapter of Job this agency is de-

* Cosmos, p. 69.

† Ib. p. 143.

‡ Ib. p. 67.

§ Ib.

|| Ib.

¶ See *Edinburgh Review*, Jan. 1849, p. 69.

scribed as entering the ocean of matter, and dividing it hither and thither, like the valves of opening doors, thrusting it forcibly asunder, and rolling it round, thus giving each separate mass of nebulous vapour two distinct motions,—rotary, round its own centre gravity, and translatory, through space; and such is, in fact, the real state of the realms of space. “If, for a moment,” says Humboldt, “we could yield to the power of fancy, and imagine the acuteness of our visual organs to be made equal with the extremest bounds of telescopic vision, and bring together that which is now divided by long periods of time, the apparent rest which reigns in space would suddenly disappear. We should see the countless hosts of fixed stars moving in thronged groups in different directions; nebulae wandering through space, and becoming condensed and dissolved like cosmical clouds, . . . and *motion* ruling supreme in every portion of the vault of heaven;”* all the stellar islands filling space are moving through it. And according to the felicitous conjecture of Kepler, now universally accepted, “the sun itself, whose spots were not then discovered, together with all the planets and fixed stars, rotates on its axis.”† This rotary motion connects this agency with the succeeding one.

The next agency of Moses is the condensation of these masses of vapour into solid bodies. Here we begin to enter on the history of our globe; all that has preceded was prior to the commencement of the formation of our planetary system. Then, according to Moses, the most ancient geognostical fact is, that the waters, or fluid matter, were condensed and compressed, and that the result was the appearance of the *arida*—dry, solid, heated matter. And what does science say? “The existence of the polar compression announces that which may be named the most ancient of all geognostic events; the condition of general fluidity of a planet, and its earlier and progressive solidification.”‡ In another passage the same writer enters more into detail: “Compression, when considered as a consequence of centrifugal force acting on a rotating mass, explains the earlier condition of fluidity of our planet. During the solidification of this fluid . . . an enormous quantity of latent heat must have been liberated. If the process of solidification began . . . by radiation from the cooling surface exposed to the atmosphere, the particles near the centre would have continued fluid and hot—(thus it has been assumed, and confirmed by direct experiments) that with increasing depth the subterranean heat likewise increases.”§

Moses attributes the elevation of the land over the waters,

* Cosmos, p. 139.

† Ib. p. 711.

‡ Ib. p. 736.

§ Ib. p. 164.

and the division of earth and sea, to the same agency. Humboldt says the same: "The consideration of the increase of heat with the increase of depth towards the interior of our planet, and of the reaction of the interior on the external crust, leads us to the long series of volcanic phenomena. These elastic forces are manifested in earthquakes, &c., and even in producing alterations in the level of the sea. Large plains and variously indented continents are raised or sunk, *lands are separated from seas*, &c. The boundaries of sea and land, of fluids and solids, are thus variously and frequently changed. Plains have undergone oscillatory movements, being alternately elevated and depressed. After the elevation of continents, mountain chains were raised upon long fissures, &c., and salt lakes and inland seas forcibly separated. Thus in following phenomena in their mutual dependence, we are led from the consideration of the forces acting in the interior of the earth to those which cause eruptions on its surface."*

Thus we are led from "gravitation, which must be considered as a primitive force in matter," to its consequences,—those "attractions of another kind which are at work around us, both in the interior of our planet and on its surface. These forces, to which we apply the term *chemical affinity*, act upon molecules in contact, and which being differently modified by heat, electricity, condensation in porous bodies, or by the contact of an intermediate substance, animate equally the inorganic world, and animal and vegetable tissues."† Moses accordingly tells us, that the same agency which had solidified the earth, and divided land and sea, went on to produce the dawn of vegetation on the earth. The same chemical laws that had arranged the inorganic matter of the earth go on to produce first of all "the simple cell, the first manifestation of life, and advance progressively to higher structures;"‡ the first origin of cells, Humboldt tells us, is "concealed in the obscurity of some chemical process."§ This process is indicated by Moses in these words, "Let the earth bring forth the green herb," &c. He gives us to understand the three following facts regarding the production of vegetation: first, that vegetation is a characteristic of the dry land or earth, as the first animal life is of the water; secondly, that vegetation preceded animal life on our globe; thirdly, that vegetation commenced before the solar atmosphere was concentrated round the sun, at a period when our planet floated in an opaque luminous vapour.

On the first point Humboldt's testimony is unequivocal: "The solid portion of the earth's surface is suited to the luxu-

* Cosmos, p. 152.

† Ib. p. 360.

‡ Ib. p. 44.

§ Ib. p. 360.

rious development of vegetable life, while in the encircling sea organic life is almost entirely limited to the animal world."*

With regard to the second point, his testimony is more at variance. "Nothing appears to corroborate the theoretical view that vegetable preceded animal life, and that the former was necessarily dependent on the latter."† Not, on the other hand, that there is any proof of the contrary proposition, because "the oldest transition strata contain cellular marine plants." But still, animal remains are more common in the lowest secondary strata than vegetables. "These strata contain but few plants; they present, however, a singular association of animal forms, crustacea, corals, &c.; and, blended with these low organisms, fishes of the most singular forms, imbedded in the upper silurian formations."‡ But then we must remember that the lowest fossiliferous strata are the sedimentary rocks, which are the deposits of lime and other matters once held in solution by the waters. Now Moses himself tells us, that the period when the waters covered the whole earth was the period when animal life received its first impulse; but he indicates a period prior to this, when the dry crust of the earth brought forth vegetable organisms. Now on what are these sedimentary strata deposited? On the primary rocks, granite, porphyry, basalt, &c., all of which indicate the action of fire. Humboldt writes, "I should deem it more than probable that a primordial granite rock forms the substratum of the whole stratified edifice of fossil remains."§ There must have been a time when the surface of this granite rock formed the external surface of our planet, when the greater part of that which is now above it, the lime, the carbon, the water, the air, was as yet in the state of vapour, uncondensed and unagglomerated; the water perhaps still partly in its simple elements, oxygen and hydrogen, extending to an immense distance round the radiating sphere of our planet. It is to this period that Moses assigns the first commencement of cellular organisation. Now, of course, as the granite rock has been in a state of fusion since the period of the deposit of the lower secondary formations, it cannot be expected that any remains of vegetable organisation should have survived that intense heat. Still there does seem to be an indication that vegetation was then active on our planet. Two out of the three constituents of granite, mica and feldspar, contain potash; a substance which Humboldt thinks, in many kinds of rocks, "probably antecedent to the dawn of vegetation on the earth's surface;"|| but it is only a *proba-*

* Cosmos, p. 153.

§ Ib. p. 289.

† Ib. p. 281.

|| Ib. p. 272.

‡ Ib. p. 275.

bility, while there is also a counter-probability that this potash is the result of a primitive vegetation.

Another point which we must take into account is this, Who can define the precise limit between the animal and vegetable kingdoms? Did Moses reckon the infusoria, the corals, and such-like low organisms, as *descheh*, cellular plants, or as the *reptile animæ viventis* of the fifth day?

Or, again, is it possible to say whether under the lowest rocks of eruption, there may not exist strata that have been overflowed by them, as the granite has covered the slate, limestone, and chalk, in different localities; and whether these yet undiscovered strata do not contain the remains of vegetable organisms without any trace of animal existence?

But Humboldt himself sometimes speaks as if vegetation was a great agent in the very earliest periods of our planet: "At the same primitive period of universal volcanic activity, those enormous quantities of carbon* must have escaped from the earth which are contained in limestone rocks, and which, if separated from oxygen and reduced to a solid form, would constitute about the eighth part of the absolute bulk of the (limestone) mountain masses. That portion of the carbon which was not taken up by alkaline earths, but remained mixed with the atmosphere, as carbonic acid, *was gradually consumed by the vegetation of the earlier stages of the world*, so that the atmosphere, after being purified by the processes of vegetable life, only retained the small quantity which it now possesses, and which is not injurious to the present organisation of animal life."† Add to this, that the skeletons of diatomaceæ have been found in the lava of volcanic mountains;‡ and though Dr. Hooker thinks that the silicious skeletons of these vegetables have passed from without into the lower fissures of the mountain, and then passing into the stream of lava, been thrown out, unacted upon by the heat to which they had been exposed, yet it is evidently possible that they may have been cast up from the volcanic foci in the primitive rocks of the centre of the earth: if this be so, it at once settles the question of the priority of the vegetable world. Neither is it unlikely that these minute vegetable organisms should have furnished the mass of potash of the primitive rocks, when we consider the analogy of the animal kingdom,§ in which the forms which we term microscopic

* Might not this vast quantity of carbon have resulted from the masses of vegetable substance decomposed and consumed by the heat of this period of universal volcanic agency?

† *Cosmos*, p. 215.

§ *Ib.* p. 352.

‡ *Ib.* p. 352, note.

occupy the largest space, in consequence of their rapid propagation.

As to the third point, that vegetation commenced before the solar atmosphere was concentrated round the sun, at a period when our planet floated in an opaque luminous vapour, this follows naturally, if we grant that vegetation was active on the primordial granite rock, when it constituted the surface of our planet, and when all that is now deposited above it surrounded our globe as an immensely extended atmosphere of cosmical vapour. For at that time our earth must have been simply a nucleus of the great solar nebula. Not that Moses implies that vegetation was highly developed at this period, when as yet there were no seasons, no day and night, no provision for the periodicity of vegetable life, but simply that this was the era of its introduction.

The next fact of Moses is the condensation of the luminous solar atmosphere. "The limitation of the solar atmosphere," says Humboldt, "in its *present* concentrated condition, is especially remarkable when we compare the central body of our system with the nucleus of other nebulous stars, in some of which the outer nebulous layer is a hundred and fifty times farther removed from the central body than our earth is from the sun."* The zodiacal light he considers to be caused by a compressed annulus of nebulous matter revolving freely in space between the orbits of Venus and Mars, and which sometimes does not appear to extend beyond our earth's orbit: it is conjectured to be intimately connected with the more condensed cosmical vapour in the vicinity of the sun. This ring is a monument of an epoch when the orbit of our earth was included in the solar atmosphere; and our system, with regard to mutual illumination, must have presented some analogies with the multiple stars,† where two or more self-luminous bodies revolve around one common centre of gravity. By this agency the planets of our system ceased to be self-luminous; an event that must be placed in the same category with the sudden apparition and disappearance of three new stars in 1572, 1600, and 1604,‡ and the variation of numberless other stars. Philosophers have not decided whether the sun still changes its constitution and splendour, like the greater number of the stars; or whether, on the contrary, it has yet attained to a permanent condition.§

* Cosmos, p. 130.

† Ibid. p. 73.

‡ Cosmos, p. 709. Humboldt says that the extinction of these three stars has already led to the assumption of other and non-luminous cosmical bodies.—p. 124.

§ Cosmos, p. 309, note.

With regard to the epoch at which this concentration of the solar atmosphere must have happened, Moses places it *after* the solidification of the main body of the planets. This is confirmed by the zodiacal light, which appears to have been *left* in its present position by the retiring and concentrating solar atmosphere after the planets were all in their present places; and by the analogy of the multiple stars, which may be supposed to be solid nuclei surrounded with self-luminous vapour, if the vapour were to be removed from one such body, and concentrated round the other, it would cause precisely the same effects as Moses describes in the agency of the fourth day.

The next fact mentioned by Moses is the introduction of animal life; he places animals in the following order: 1. fishes, *reptile animæ viventis*; 2. birds; 3. mammalia; 4. and last, man. The first two families he connects with a period when almost the whole earth was covered with water; when, as we may suppose, the oxygen and hydrogen of the atmosphere had combined and had precipitated itself to the earth in the form of water, covering the primitive granite rock with the lowest sedimental deposits. At this period animals made their first appearance; first of all, the animal forms of shell-fish and molusca, corals, and, blended with these low organisms, fishes of the most singular forms: thus "fishes are the most ancient of all vertebrata."* "Saurians begin with the zechstone,"† the second period of the sedimentary rocks. Then with regard to birds, Humboldt has fallen into a grave error; he says, that "the first mammalia are found in the oolitic formations (fourth period of the sedimentary rocks), and the first birds in the most ancient cretaceous strata (the fifth period). Such," he says, "are, according to the present state of our knowledge, the lowest limits of fishes, reptiles, mammalia, and birds." It is curious that Humboldt should have fallen into this error; for, as his translator points out in a note to p. 273, before the year 1836 it was discovered that the slabs of the new red sandstone (second period) in the valley of the Connecticut were impressed with numerous footmarks of birds, proving that these creatures must have existed two whole geological periods, perhaps millions of years, before mammalia began to appear on the earth. Here is an undeniable triumph of Moses over the philosopher, testified to by science itself.

All scientific men seem to agree that man appeared last of all upon the earth. And in the question of the unity or plurality of his origin, Humboldt accepts the former both on his-

* *Cosmos*, p. 275.

† *Ibid.* p. 278.

torical and scientific grounds. "In my opinion, more powerful reasons can be advanced in support of the theory of the unity of the human race (one common descent); as, for instance, in the many intermediate gradations in the colour of the skin and in the form of the skull, the analogies presented by the varieties in the species of many wild and domesticated animals, and the more correct observations collected regarding the limits of fecundity of hybrids."* Again, "the separate mythical relations found to exist independently of one another in different parts of the earth . . . concur in ascribing the generation of the whole human race to the union of one pair."† And he concludes: "While we maintain the unity of the human species, we at the same time repel the distressing assumption of superior and inferior races of men." Our work is to "strive to remove the barriers which prejudice and limited views of every kind have erected amongst men, to treat all mankind without reference to religion (!), nation, or colour, as one fraternity, one great community, fitted for the attainment of one object, the unrestrained development of the psychical powers."‡

The last fact narrated by Moses is the seventh day, or day of rest and stability, which succeeded the chaotic revolutions attendant upon the introduction of the agencies of the formation of the universe. And Humboldt tells us that "the awful revolutions" which the earth has undergone "have served after the establishment of repose, and on the revival of organic life, to furnish a richer and more beautiful variety of individual forms, and to remove from the earth the impoverishing aspect of dreary uniformity."§ And although science, in accordance with revelation, bids us look for a day when the earth shall be again laid waste, and tells us that "all geognostic phenomena indicate the periodic alternation of activity and repose;"|| that "the quiet we now enjoy is only apparent," and that there is no reason why the interior forces should not again burst forth and involve all things in ruin; yet it at the same time tells us that the disturbing forces were more strongly developed in the earlier periods of our planet than at present,¶ that we are now enjoying a real sabbath of nature, in comparison of the commotion which once reigned: "whilst on a superficial area equal to that of Europe," says Humboldt, "there are now scarcely more than four volcanoes remaining through which fire and stones are erupted, the thinner, more fissured, and unstable crust of the earth was anciently almost every where covered by channels of communication between the fused interior and the external atmosphere."**

* *Cosmos*, p. 361.

|| *Ib.* p. 306.

† *Ib.* p. 364.

¶ *Ib.* p. 301.

‡ *Ib.* p. 368.

** *Ib.* p. 249.

§ *Ib.* p. 304.

Thus we have in our sacred books a description of six great agencies in the formation of the world; their order, progress, and succession are indicated to us. For centuries these passages have been the ridicule of sceptical philosophers, and a severe trial to the faith of many a scientific believer. But now, after ages of toil, science, approaching its perfection, announces to us as its own profound theories and brilliant discoveries, the same truths which Moses announced three thousand years ago. Science at length tells us that the primitive condition of matter is vapourous, or gaseous, and invisible; that light is the great chemical, if not mechanical agent of the universe; that light is diffused in vast nebulae of self-luminous vapour before it is concentrated in suns and stars; that fluidity is the primary condition of our planet; that vegetables are at least as ancient as animals, and probably more so; that animals appeared in the following order: 1st, marine animals, mollusca, fish, and reptiles; 2d, birds; 3d, mammalia, and lastly, *man*, and that the human race is of one origin. Thus Moses, from the midst of the dark period of primitive views of cosmical phenomena, not only announces to us facts which have only recently begun to glimmer on the opening eyes of science, but he also announces a chain of order and connexion, beginning from the first agency of the vibration of the æther, manifesting itself in light, repulsion, gravitation, attraction, and chemical combination,—a chain by which natural forces are linked together, and made mutually dependent on each other. Science has not yet attained to sufficient maturity to pronounce absolutely on the point; but when it confirms the announcements of the inspired writer, its highest glory will be to prove that he was supernaturally in possession of a result which, at the present time, still belongs to the futurity of science, and which, as Humboldt says, “can only be reaped as the fruit of observation and intellect, combined with the spirit of the age, in which are reflected all the varied phases of thought.”* Moses enjoyed the communion of a higher Spirit; and the spirit of the age, which is a spirit of hostility to Moses and to the Spirit that inspired him, has been forced hitherto, in spite of its repugnance, to confirm his account to the very minutest particular; for every advance that science has yet made is a fresh proof of his accuracy.

* *Cosmos*, p. 1.

CELEBRATED SANCTUARIES OF THE MADONNA.

No. III.—TUSCANY.

FLORENCE.—SS. *Annunziata*.

IF Rome is distinguished above other cities for the number and antiquity of her churches dedicated to the Mother of God, and Naples for the simplicity and fervour of the public devotion towards her, Florence too has a very special claim upon those who wish to chronicle "the Glories of Mary," inasmuch as it was the birthplace of a religious order called after her name, and even (for such indeed is the literal truth) founded immediately by herself.

In the early part of the thirteenth century, there stood upon the spot now occupied by Giotto's most beautiful *campanile* attached to the cathedral of that city, a little chapel dedicated to *Santa Maria delle Laudi*. This chapel belonged to a certain confraternity of persons living in the world, who used to assemble here for purposes of prayer and praise, if not daily, yet at least on all holy days, and especially on all festivals of the Madonna, and who hence received the name of *i Laudesi*. It was a large confraternity, and reckoned among its members men from some of the highest families in Florence. On the 15th of August, A.D. 1233, they met as usual to celebrate the Assumption of our Blessed Lady; and when the holy sacrifice had been offered and all the devotional exercises of the confraternity concluded, they left the chapel to return to their own homes; seven of the brethren, however, remained, each too deeply impressed by something extraordinary that had happened to him, to be able to make up his mind so soon to leave the house of prayer. After several minutes of solemn silence, each of the seven marvelling at his neighbour's delay, and unwilling to avow the cause of his own, they seem all instinctively to have turned their eyes upon the oldest amongst them, Buonfigliuolo Monaldi, and to have sought from him the desired explanation. It was not without great hesitation that Monaldi at length responded to this silent appeal, and recounted to his wondering companions a vision which he had had, and which, as it now appeared, had really been common to them all. To each the Blessed Virgin had manifested herself in the midst of a globe of dazzling light, touched him with a ray thereof, and bid him leave the world and retire to a spot which she would direct.

The vision had been vouchsafed to each individually, and

each had received a separate call without any reference to the others who were to be his companions; yet they not unreasonably conjectured that what had been revealed simultaneously to so many was intended to be executed in unison by all; and they lost no time in obeying the heavenly vision. They were all men of rank and of considerable personal distinction, some of them holding official situations in the government; nevertheless, such was their earnestness and zeal, that in the course of three short weeks they managed to divest themselves of every thing that could present an obstacle to the fulfilment of their purpose. Magistracies, wealth, family ties of the closest kind, in a word, every worldly incumbrance that can be conceived most prejudicial (humanly speaking) to a religious vocation, held these men in bondage, when first the Madonna appeared to them on the Feast of her Assumption; yet before the Feast of her Nativity, on the following 8th of September, they had so thoroughly disentangled themselves from every thing, that on that day they were able to go out of Florence, seven poor men altogether destitute of this world's goods. Being laymen, they had provided themselves with the company of a holy priest, one Jacopo da Poggibonzi, who had been their director in the confraternity *de' Laudesi*, and who, when he heard of their proposed plan of life, and had obtained the Bishop's consent, gladly cast in his lot with theirs.

These eight men, leading a life of religious seclusion and of the greatest austerity in a little hamlet not far from the walls of the city, were too striking a sight not to arrest the public attention even in those days of political strife and disturbance. Moreover, their fame was noised abroad still more widely by a miracle which God wrought, not once only, or twice, but three or four times, and in the presence of several hundred persons. As two or three of the holy band went about the city in quest of alms for their support, crowds used to gather together to see them, to see one of the noble family of Falconieri, or Uguccioni, or the others whom they had known as among the wealthiest citizens of the republic, now clad in a mean penitential garb, and going about literally a mendicant. On three or four of these occasions, infants of a few months old, as they lay in their mothers' or their nurses' arms, received the gift of speech, and cried out as they passed, "Behold the Servants of Mary!" One of these children was St. Philip Benizi, who was born on the very day on which the Madonna had called them to this mode of life, and who spoke these words on the 13th of January in the following year, when he was scarcely five months old. At seventeen years of age he became himself one of these "Servants of Mary." Afterwards,

when he was grown up, and had "done the work of an Evangelist," he was called in a special manner "the Apostle of Mary;" he lived to be the general of the new order, and finally was canonised as one of its earliest Saints. The anecdote which we have given is recorded in the lessons appointed for the office of his day; and the general fact is attested by the still more ancient testimony of a Bull of Innocent VIII., bearing date of May 27, 1487, in which, speaking of this order, it is said, that "having been called the Servants of Mary from their very first foundation, by the disposition of God and *as it were divinely out of the mouth of infants*, they have always, out of reverence for this fact, preserved this devout title."

For it must be remembered that when these men retired from the world, it was not with any idea of founding a new order, and therefore they had never dreamt of giving themselves any distinctive appellation; they sought only the salvation of their own souls; and when persons flocked from the city to come and visit them in their cells, their humility and their love of solitude took fright; and in obedience to another vision of the Blessed Virgin, they retired to Monte Senario, a wild uncultivated mountain, distant nine or ten miles from the city, and utterly uninhabited. It was still necessary, therefore, that they should sometimes send into Florence for the means of subsistence; but as the fatigue of the journey to and fro, and of begging alms in the streets, was too great for a single day, and yet they were forbidden by their rule ever to spend the night out of their own cells in the house of any secular friend, they were obliged to provide a second home somewhere nearer to the city. Their old residence of Camarzia lay in another direction, quite out of the way for one who wished to go from Florence to Monte Senario; so they built themselves a little cell on a spot of ground just outside the walls on their own side of the city, called Cafaggio, and this served as a temporary resting-place for their *questuanti* as often as they had occasion to travel so far from home.

At Monte Senario they lived in the strictest retirement for a period of five years, giving themselves up to prayer and meditation, and to the practice of corporal austerities, such as rivalled those of the Egyptian anchorites of old in their extraordinary severity. Indeed it was so extreme, that both the Bishop of Florence, Ardingo de' Trotti, who had always been their warmest friend and most prudent counsellor, and Cardinal Gualfrido Castiglione, who visited them in his capacity of Papal Legate, found it necessary to put a check upon it by the interposition of their authority. During this time, they

each had received a separate call without any reference to the others who were to be his companions; yet they not unreasonably conjectured that what had been revealed simultaneously to so many was intended to be executed in unison by all; and they lost no time in obeying the heavenly vision. They were all men of rank and of considerable personal distinction, some of them holding official situations in the government; nevertheless, such was their earnestness and zeal, that in the course of three short weeks they managed to divest themselves of every thing that could present an obstacle to the fulfilment of their purpose. Magistracies, wealth, family ties of the closest kind, in a word, every worldly incumbrance that can be conceived most prejudicial (humanly speaking) to a religious vocation, held these men in bondage, when first the Madonna appeared to them on the Feast of her Assumption; yet before the Feast of her Nativity, on the following 8th of September, they had so thoroughly disentangled themselves from every thing, that on that day they were able to go out of Florence, seven poor men altogether destitute of this world's goods. Being laymen, they had provided themselves with the company of a holy priest, one Jacopo da Poggibonzi, who had been their director in the confraternity *de' Laudesi*, and who, when he heard of their proposed plan of life, and had obtained the Bishop's consent, gladly cast in his lot with theirs.

These eight men, leading a life of religious seclusion and of the greatest austerity in a little hamlet not far from the walls of the city, were too striking a sight not to arrest the public attention even in those days of political strife and disturbance. Moreover, their fame was noised abroad still more widely by a miracle which God wrought, not once only, or twice, but three or four times, and in the presence of several hundred persons. As two or three of the holy band went about the city in quest of alms for their support, crowds used to gather together to see them, to see one of the noble family of Falconieri, or Uguccioni, or the others whom they had known as among the wealthiest citizens of the republic, now clad in a mean penitential garb, and going about literally a mendicant. On three or four of these occasions, infants of a few months old, as they lay in their mothers' or their nurses' arms, received the gift of speech, and cried out as they passed, "Behold the Servants of Mary!" One of these children was St. Philip Benizi, who was born on the very day on which the Madonna had called them to this mode of life, and who spoke these words on the 13th of January in the following year, when he was scarcely five months old. At seventeen years of age he became himself one of these "Servants of Mary." Afterwards,

when he was grown up, and had "done the work of an Evangelist," he was called in a special manner "the Apostle of Mary;" he lived to be the general of the new order, and finally was canonised as one of its earliest Saints. The anecdote which we have given is recorded in the lessons appointed for the office of his day; and the general fact is attested by the still more ancient testimony of a Bull of Innocent VIII., bearing date of May 27, 1487, in which, speaking of this order, it is said, that "having been called the Servants of Mary from their very first foundation, by the disposition of God and *as it were divinely out of the mouth of infants*, they have always, out of reverence for this fact, preserved this devout title."

For it must be remembered that when these men retired from the world, it was not with any idea of founding a new order, and therefore they had never dreamt of giving themselves any distinctive appellation; they sought only the salvation of their own souls; and when persons flocked from the city to come and visit them in their cells, their humility and their love of solitude took fright; and in obedience to another vision of the Blessed Virgin, they retired to Monte Senario, a wild uncultivated mountain, distant nine or ten miles from the city, and utterly uninhabited. It was still necessary, therefore, that they should sometimes send into Florence for the means of subsistence; but as the fatigue of the journey to and fro, and of begging alms in the streets, was too great for a single day, and yet they were forbidden by their rule ever to spend the night out of their own cells in the house of any secular friend, they were obliged to provide a second home somewhere nearer to the city. Their old residence of Camarzia lay in another direction, quite out of the way for one who wished to go from Florence to Monte Senario; so they built themselves a little cell on a spot of ground just outside the walls on their own side of the city, called Cafaggio, and this served as a temporary resting-place for their *questuanti* as often as they had occasion to travel so far from home.

At Monte Senario they lived in the strictest retirement for a period of five years, giving themselves up to prayer and meditation, and to the practice of corporal austerities, such as rivalled those of the Egyptian anchorites of old in their extraordinary severity. Indeed it was so extreme, that both the Bishop of Florence, Ardingo de' Trotti, who had always been their warmest friend and most prudent counsellor, and Cardinal Gualfrido Castiglione, who visited them in his capacity of Papal Legate, found it necessary to put a check upon it by the interposition of their authority. During this time, they

had often been earnestly petitioned, both by men of the world and by their ecclesiastical superiors, to allow other persons to attach themselves to the community, that so they might not only save their own souls, but also teach others to do the same; this, however, they always steadily refused, declaring that they were not yet equal to the government of themselves, much less competent to direct others.

At last, on the third Sunday in Lent, A.D. 1239, they were amazed by finding that a vineyard which they had lately planted on their barren mountain had suddenly burst forth into blossom, and was even then bearing a plentiful harvest of ripe grapes, spite of the inclemency of the season (it was only the 27th of February). Confident that this miracle had been wrought, not so much for its own sake, as for the sake of conveying to them some important admonition from above, they sent some of their number to relate the history to the Bishop. He in the mean while had seen something of the same kind himself in a dream, and the "God in heaven that revealeth mysteries" had given him grace to understand the meaning of it. He had seen a vine send forth seven shoots, each shoot bearing seven branches, and all laden with the richest fruit. "The Church," he said, "was often in Holy Scripture compared to a vineyard, and the fruits thereof to the multiplication of the faithful." He did not doubt, then, but that his own dream and the miracle which had happened on the mountain were both intended to convey the same lesson, viz. a clear intimation that these chosen holy men should go forth and labour in His vineyard; that they should no longer be contented with their own perseverance in well-doing, but that they should seek to multiply such good works by inviting others to follow their example, and the success which would attend their labours was typified in the abundance of the grapes which they had both seen.

Unable any longer to withstand the Bishop's importunity, they prepared to admit others into their company, a step which they determined on taking immediately after Easter. But on Good Friday (which in that year chanced to fall on the 25th of March, the Feast of the Annunciation), as they were all assembled together, meditating on the sufferings of our Lord's Mother—for who, in such a coincidence of events to be commemorated on the same day, could fail to think on those words of Simeon, "And thine own soul a sword shall pierce!"—behold, she herself once more vouchsafed to appear to them, accompanied by numbers of the heavenly host, some of whom bore in their hands the various instruments of the Passion, others religious habits of the same colour and fashion

as those which the order still wears, another carried an open book containing the Rule of St. Augustin, and another a tablet with the words *Servants of Mary* written in letters of gold, and ornamented with the palm-branch, the well-known emblem of victory and the type of never-fading glory. Having explained to them the meaning of these symbols, and commended to their special devotion her own mysterious Dolours, she disappeared; and on the following Sunday, after having celebrated the Paschal Mass in his own cathedral, the Bishop, who had again been favoured with the same vision as these holy recluses, came out to Monte Senario, and the new Institute was begun.

Thus we see with what reason writers of this order are in the habit of speaking, as they constantly do, of our Blessed Lady as having been their *foundress*. Neither directly nor indirectly was the Institute the fruit of human wisdom; from first to last the finger of God was distinctly visible in a most remarkable way; first, the Blessed Virgin herself selects her own instruments, and bids them retire from the world; then, "out of the mouth of infants and of sucklings" she gives them their name, and sets them apart in a special manner as her *servants*; lastly, after five years of secret but earnest preparation in the solitude of the mountain, she again appears to give them the rule of life they are to follow, the uniform they are to wear, the banner under which they are to fight; and thus she sends them forth to the battle with every pledge and assurance of victory.

But we must not pursue the interesting story of these seven *beati* any further. In their new character of priests and missionaries they were scattered about in different cities of Germany, France, and Italy, yet eventually they all returned to their own dear Monte Senario, to lay their bodies together in one common grave under the high altar of their church. Our business, however, lies only with the little oratory at Cafaggio, without the walls of Florence, which it was soon found necessary to rebuild and enlarge. The foundation-stone of the new fabric was laid by B. Buonfigliuolo on the 8th of September, 1250; and as, after all, it was but a humble chapel, the work was soon completed, so that in 1252, a Florentine, by name Bartolomeo, was commissioned to paint a fresco upon the wall representing the mystery of the Annunciation. Bartolomeo was one of those artists who trusted less to their skill and knowledge of the art than to their devotion in works of this kind; he looked upon the painting of any religious subject, especially in a church, as a directly religious act, and prepared for it by prayer and meditation, as he would have done for any other great and

good work. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that, in the present instance, an artist such as this should have felt more than usually anxious; for he was called upon to represent the Blessed Virgin in the most mysterious scene and moment of her life, and in a church belonging to men who had enjoyed the privilege of looking upon her countenance, and whom she had specially called to herself, and set apart as her servants.

Bartolomeo had already spent a considerable time in the execution of his task; indeed, a casual visitor might have said that it was almost completed, for nothing was wanting save the faces of the Blessed Virgin and of the Angel. These he had again and again attempted, but always in vain; he was never able to satisfy himself that his pencil would portray with faithfulness the vision which was present to his imagination, nor even that that vision was in any way worthy of its subject. At length the Feast of the Annunciation was at hand, and it was impossible to delay any longer. He returned to the church with the desperate resolution of finishing it, took his pencil in hand, but again laid it down, and gave himself up to meditation. In this state he was overtaken by sleep, and when he awoke, after the lapse of a few minutes, the work was done. *Miracolo! miracolo!* was the almost involuntary exclamation of the painter and of the few others who were in the church with him, and who ran together to see what had happened; and the fame of this new miracle granted to the Servants of Mary soon drew hundreds of persons to visit the favoured spot. On the day of the festival, the Bishop himself, accompanied by his clergy and the civil magistrates of the city, came in solemn procession to venerate the new picture; and from that day to this the church of the *Santissima Annunziata* has held a very high place amongst the famous Sanctuaries of the Madonna. It was rebuilt again immediately afterwards (that is to say, within ten years), on a much larger scale, by a brother of one of the seven, the father of St. Juliana Falconieri; and when, twenty years later still, the enlargement of the boundaries of the city brought it within the circuit of the walls, it was of sufficient importance to induce the magistrates of the republic to order a little gate to be made near it in the new walls, expressly for the convenience of the numerous pilgrims who came to visit this shrine.

Of the public devotion, both in times past and present, towards this picture—which, amid all alterations and additions to the church, has ever remained untouched—it is scarcely possible to convey an adequate idea. As long ago as the very first year of the fifteenth century, it was found necessary to

pass a law, prohibiting any one to put up an *ex voto* offering who was not both a citizen of the republic and "*abile alle arti maggiori*;" that is, foreigners and others might bring money, oil, candles, or gifts of that kind, but it was to be an exclusive privilege of the Florentines, and amongst *them* too only of such as were good artists themselves, or could afford to employ those that were, to hang up those material offerings of statues, pictures, &c., which, about most other famous pictures or statues of the Madonna, bear so eloquent a testimony to the faith of the people, but are far from contributing to the beauty and ornament of the sanctuary. How far it was possible to enforce obedience to this decree (which, it must be confessed, savours more of a devotion to the fine arts than of devotion to the Madonna), I do not know; any how, the fact that it was ever made is a very striking proof of the estimation in which this sanctuary was held, not only by the inhabitants of Florence, but by others also, whose offerings it was thus intended to exclude. Moreover, we know that in spite of it, both a considerable portion of the church itself, and also the whole of the large cloister in front of it, was at one time full of memorials of this kind; and that as recently as the year 1785 a large number of small statues and similar votive offerings in silver were converted into lamps and other sacred vessels for the use of the chapel. Upwards of forty silver lamps, some of them of considerable size and richly gilt, hang before the altar; the altar itself is likewise of silver; and the walls of the ancient Oratory are incrustated to the height of four or five feet with symbols of the Blessed Virgin, the *Rosa Mystica*, the *Stella Maris*, and others, beautifully wrought in *pietra dura* in the style peculiar to this city. This extreme richness of the material fabric of the chapel and of its abundant ornaments sufficiently attests the devotion of the ancient Florentines towards this *Santa Maria Madre di grazie*, as they used to call her; and the number of the faithful who are always to be seen kneeling and praying before it assures us that, in our own times, this devotion, so far from being exhausted, is as strong and fervent as it ever was; neither, indeed, does the present generation fall far behind its predecessors in the number or the costliness of their gifts. Two of the magnificent silver candlesticks which adorn the altar were presented by a Florentine noble in 1810; one of the largest and most splendid of the lamps was given by the King of Naples, and another by a Florentine marquis, both within the present century; and a third, scarcely inferior to either, has been presented during this very year by the people of Florence, in acknowledgment of their speedy deliverance from the horrors of anarchy and

rebellion, by which they were threatened; not to mention what perhaps is the most striking and touching feature of the whole, the more humble but more frequent offerings of the poorer classes. Sunday after Sunday, at certain seasons of the year, long processions of religious confraternities of men and women may be seen wending their way through the narrow streets and over the picturesque bridges of that fair city, all guiding their steps towards the same sanctuary of the Santissima Annunziata. Some are come perhaps from a neighbouring village, others only from a distant quarter of the city; and as they move along with lighted candles in their hands, and bearing aloft the crucifix and the banner of their association, you may hear them chant numerous psalms or hymns to the praise and glory of God, and of her "whom the King hath had a mind to honour." In the rear of each procession follows a heavily-laden donkey, bringing the wax, or the oil, or whatever else they may have been able to afford as an offering to their beloved Madonna. And it must be remembered that this is only a specimen on a larger scale of what is continually going on in private,—a collective manifestation of what is felt by every Florentine in particular towards this most interesting and remarkable sanctuary. "The intense feelings of the Florentines with reference to this picture," writes a stranger who was visiting the city in 1836, "cannot be conceived by one who only hears of it; it can scarcely even be credited by those who witness it;" and certainly my own observations, as far as a short visit of six or seven weeks enabled me to make any, all tended to confirm the accuracy of this remark.

PRATO.—1. *Madonna della Sacra Cintola.*

The interest of the next sanctuary which we propose to visit does not depend upon any particular statue or picture so much as upon a relic which has been preserved there during the last seven centuries, and which still continues to attract a considerable number of pious visitors every year; I mean, the Cathedral Church of Prato, a city situated between Florence and Pistoia, that may now be reached in little more than half an hour by a railroad from the former place. The relic is the *Cingolo* or *Cintola*, that is, the girdle, of our Blessed Lady, which, according to popular tradition, was given to St. Thomas the Apostle on occasion of her assumption into heaven; I say "according to popular tradition," because it is necessary to inform our readers at once that the original history of this famous relic does not pretend to rest upon any more certain foundation. All the Apostles, with the single exception of St. Thomas, had been brought together to Jerusalem to be pre-

sent at the death of the Mother of their Lord, to witness the peaceful transit of her pure soul from this world to the next; they had also laid her body in the tomb, and they supposed it to be still lying there, when St. Thomas arrived and told them that he had seen her in the act of being taken up into heaven, that he had prayed her to leave him some parting gift, as a means of assuring himself, and enabling him to assure others, of the reality of the vision, and that she had vouchsafed, in answer to his petition, to take off her girdle and cause it to drop at his feet. Persons who are familiar with the picture-galleries of Italy will remember that this tradition has not unfrequently employed the pencils of some of the first masters; and travellers in the Holy Land tell us that a spot is still pointed out between Mount Olivet and the Valley of Josaphat as the actual scene of the vision; and moreover that certain indulgences are to be gained by those who visit it with devotion.*

Nevertheless, it is, as we have said, a mere popular tradition, for which no really ancient authority can be adduced; and both St. Antoninus of Florence and Baronius reject it as altogether apocryphal.† It must not be supposed, however, that the rejection of the tradition implies also a denial of the genuineness of the relic; on the contrary, St. Antoninus himself expressly says, that “it may piously be believed (*satis pie credi potest*) that the girdle really does exist on earth, and that it is that which is said to be at Prato, and is there shewn to the people;” and it must be remembered, that in more than one Papal Bull it is designated as such, and the religious reverence shewn to it as such expressly sanctioned and encouraged.

The earliest authentic account, then, of the relic seems to be this, that it was brought to Prato early in the twelfth century by a native of that city returning from the East; that he kept it in his own possession as a most precious treasure as long as he lived, and only on his deathbed, somewhere in the latter half of the twelfth century, consigned it to the superior of the collegiate church of St. Stephen, opposite to which he lived. This priest, it is said, laughed at the story which the dying man related to him, and was only brought to set any value at all upon the relic by certain divine judgments which seemed to follow on his contemptuous treatment of it. And even then, he was only induced to give it a place among the other relics of his church; he did not regard it with any special reverence, nor even think it worthy of being exposed

* Il Devotissimo Viaggio di Gerusalemme, del Cav. G. Zuallardo. Roma, 1587, p. 151. Viaggio al S. Sepolcro del R. P. F. Noe. Bassano, 1728, p. 76.

† St. Anton. Hist. part i. tit. 6, cap. 10, § 1. Baron. ad Ann. 48.

to the people, until an accidental circumstance (if we may so speak) revealed to him its true character and inestimable value. It was on the feast of the Beheading of St. John the Baptist, A.D. 1174, that a poor woman, possessed by an evil spirit, was brought to St. Stephen's to receive the exorcisms of the Church. All the usual relics were applied, but to no purpose, when one of the priests bethought himself of having recourse to this one, which was unknown to most, and but doubtfully received by any. Immediately on its approach, the devil acknowledged its power and his own defeat; and having first, in answer to the inquiries of the exorcising priest, been constrained to declare what the relic really was, he cruelly rent the body of his victim, and then visibly went out of her.

So striking a miracle as this—and it was followed by many others of a similar character—could not fail to have great influence in creating and increasing public devotion towards the instrument by which it had been wrought; just as, in the sixteenth century, the fame of our Lady of Altennotting in Bavaria greatly spread after that terrible, because so protracted, exorcism wrought there by the celebrated Father Canisius upon a member of one of the noble families of Augsburg, who had been possessed for more than eight years. The next public miracle attributed to this relic, of which any records have come down to us, was the deliverance of the city from the besieging army of Pistoia, who were instantly put to rout by it, much in the same way as in the well-known instance of the Saracen army at Assisi, after the exposition of the Blessed Sacrament by St. Clare. This was fifteen years after the exorcism which has been mentioned, that is, it was in the year 1189; and before the close of the next century, we find that the relic had become of sufficient importance to render it necessary for the civil as well as the ecclesiastical magistracy of the place to make certain laws, regulating the time and manner of its exposition. From the language of one of these decrees, dated the 10th of May, 1297, and still preserved in the archives of the chancery of Prato, we see clearly how strong was the popular devotion towards it, how great the anxiety to come near it, to obtain a close view of it, and to be allowed the privilege of touching it with medals or other sacred objects. The most minute directions are given upon these subjects; and it is ordered that it shall never be exposed, excepting in the presence both of the chief magistrates and of the highest clerical dignitaries.

This rule has been constantly observed ever since; the relic has always been quite as much in the hands of the

judges and other civil officers of Prato, as of the canons of St. Stephen's; at least, its exposition has been quite under their control; at one time two, and at another three, of the four keys which are necessary to unlock the chest in which it was preserved, were in their custody, and the fourth only entrusted to the chapter of the cathedral; frequent quarrels, sometimes ending even in acts of violence on the part of the laity, arose between these joint guardians of the treasure as to the best mode of disposing of the numerous offerings which were made to it; and these quarrels were subject to the arbitration of the civil and ecclesiastical tribunals; in a word, the records of the city of Prato during the latter half of the thirteenth century contain abundant evidence of the intense devotion as well of its own citizens as of the Tuscans generally, towards this interesting relic. Early in the fourteenth century, on the 27th of July, A.D. 1312, an attempt was made by a man employed in some servile work about the church, to carry it off, with the intention, as he himself confessed, of transferring it to Florence, where he hoped to receive a handsome reward for his theft. He was detected, however, in the very act; and the extreme severity, as well as rapidity, with which he was punished—on the very day on which the theft was discovered, he was burnt alive, after having had both his hands cut off, and being dragged through the streets at the heels of an ass,—this sufficiently attests the popular indignation against him, and, by consequence, the high estimation in which the object of his sacrilegious attempt was generally held. Two days afterwards a decree was made for the enlargement of the church, and the erection of a chapel specially destined for the reception and safer custody of the precious relic. Considerable delays, arising from various causes, interfered with the execution of this work; and, in fact, it was only executed, like so many other noble works in days of old, slowly, and by degrees; in the end, however, no pains were spared to render the work worthy of its object. Giovanni di Pisa was the architect; Gaddi painted the walls of the chapel of the Cintola; and the marble pulpit on the outside of the church, from whence the relic was to be exposed to the assembled multitudes beneath, was from the chisel of the famous Donatello, and is reckoned among the finest specimens of his skill; thus furnishing another instance of what is so common in the history of the middle ages, devotion to the Blessed Mother of God proving the most efficient patron of the fine arts, and indirectly giving birth to some of their noblest and most beautiful fruits. It is stated that, at the final translation of the relic, in the year 1395, to the chapel where it now

is, there were present upwards of 30,000 persons; and indeed, in those days, on each annual recurrence of the festival of the Nativity of our Lady, the concourse of people to this sanctuary was so extraordinary, that it was found necessary to expose the relic three times instead of once only,—morning, noon, and evening, that so the crowd might be divided and diminished, for it had become such as to cause serious apprehension of mischief.

It seems not to have been an unusual thing for the government to give a general release of prisoners on this day, by way of doing honour to the relic, just as the first Christian emperors were wont to distinguish the great festival of Easter by a similar act of clemency. On the vigil, each of the eight-and-forty villages which constitute the *commune* or *hundred* of Prato used to bring an offering of a large wax-candle; so did the magistrates of the city on the feast itself, and an offering of money besides; so also did the several guilds or confraternities of scribes, merchants, bankers, clothiers, chemists, smiths, shoemakers, butchers, cheesemongers, sellers of wine, tailors, bakers, pastry-cooks, barbers, and carpenters. At present, the relic is exposed not only on this day, but also on Easter-day and at Christmas, and on the first day of the month of May, as also on all occasions of great public trial and distress, such as a time of pestilence or rebellion, or occasions of public thanksgiving, such as the recent restoration of the Pope; and the number of persons who come together to see it is immense; indeed, one may at all times find persons kneeling before the altar where it is enshrined, then kissing it, and leaving their humble offerings upon it. I was assured by one of the canons that the description which was given of it by a Tuscan writer two hundred years ago might literally be repeated at the present day, that it is "*religione populorum celebre, miraculorum gloriâ illustre, gratiarum imbre opulentum.*" It still retains its ancient hold upon the love and devotion of the people, because of the numberless instances in which prayers offered there to God, through the intercession of the Blessed Virgin, have seemed to receive remarkable answers; in particular, it is the favourite resort of persons who are anxious to give up the world, and who come here to beg of God the gift of continence and perpetual chastity. There is not a Tuscan maiden within many miles of the city of Prato who desires to enter upon the novitiate of some religious house, that does not first make a pilgrimage to *Sta. Maria della Cintola*, there to ask for the grace and strength which she needs. There is also an extensive confraternity of persons living in the world which is derived entirely from this sanctuary, and

whose members, I believe, wear a cincture made something after the fashion of the original relic. That relic was in former times unfolded, and exhibited without any reliquary at all, at every solemn exposition; but in the year 1638 it was enclosed in a glass case richly ornamented with silver and precious stones, and it has never since been taken out of it. The Augustinian nuns, however, of San Matteo in Prato are in the habit of making girdles according to this pattern, or as nearly so as they are able; and these, after having been blessed, and having touched the original *cintola*, are themselves distributed to the faithful as valuable memorials or relics. Judging, then, from one of these, we may describe the *cintola* as consisting of a band about an inch and a quarter wide, and two feet and a quarter long, with two very narrow ribbons attached to either end, apparently for the purpose of fastening it round the waist. These ribbons are terminated by small tassels; and the whole seems to be woven of green and other silks, with a very slight intermixture of gold thread.

It only remains that we should mention a marble statue of our Lady and of her Divine Son which stands over the altar in the chapel of the *cintola*; it has stood there certainly for more than 350 years, and stories of miracles and special graces are connected with it. It has considerable pretensions as a mere work of art, and the clergy have often wished, therefore, to remove the dress and ornaments with which it has been loaded; but the people, not having as much good taste in matters of art as they have devotion in matters of religion, strenuously resisted the attempt, and the idea has been necessarily abandoned. A few days before my first visit to Prato, the image had been removed by order of the canons, at an hour when there was seldom any body in the church, into the sacristy, for the sake of enabling some artist to take a copy of it, if I remember rightly; anyhow, it had been removed into the sacristy for some purpose or other; but it chanced that a poor person *did* come in; and he, missing the image which his eyes were wont to rest upon, concluded it had been stolen. Without stopping to make any inquiries into the matter, he straightway went out and spread this alarming report; the result was the speedy collection of such an angry and excited crowd, as threatened to lead to quite a serious *émeute*, had not the Madonna been luckily near at hand, so that she could be immediately restored to her place.

2. Madonna delle Carceri.

We must not take leave of this city without visiting ano-

ther of Our Lady's sanctuaries, which enjoys almost an equal local celebrity, and whose history is peculiarly interesting to us all just at this time, from its similarity in origin to that of Our Lady at Rimini, whose fame has begun in our own days, I had almost said, before our own eyes.

In the year 1240, the civil authorities of Prato purchased a house near the castle or fortress of the city, to be a place of residence for the chief magistrate, and at the same time a place of confinement for a certain class of prisoners. Before the end of a hundred years, a more commodious prison had been obtained for political and other offenders, and this house was appropriated to the confinement of debtors only. In the year 1350 these too were removed elsewhere, and henceforward the house was neglected, and allowed to fall into decay and ruin. During the period of its use, however, as a prison, whether for debtors or for public criminals, a picture had been painted upon its walls, representing our Blessed Lady with a flower in one hand, and our Lord sitting on the other, who with his right hand was blessing the world as God, while with his left he was playing with a bird as a little child. On one side of these figures stood St. Stephen, as the principal protector of the city of Prato, and on the other St. Leonard, as the patron Saint of all incarcerated persons, for which reason he holds two fetters in his hands. The same picture was repeated both on the outside and inside of the wall; and underneath it was this inscription, "In the name of God. The rules of this prison are, that whoever is confined herein shall pay one *soldo* towards the lamp; and if any refuse to do so, he will not be allowed to have a share in the public alms." This was the inscription under the painting on the inner wall, for the benefit of the prisoners themselves; and on the outer wall doubtless there was an appeal to the commiseration of passers-by, and a box to receive their charitable contributions, according to the practice which still prevails in many of the prisons of Catholic countries.

The lamp, however, had long since ceased to burn, and nobody ever thought or was even conscious of the existence of this representation of the Infant Jesus and his holy Mother. The whole place was covered with briars and thorns and rank weeds; and as it lay out of the way of any great thoroughfare, few persons ever passed by and saw it. In the morning of the 6th of July, 1484, a little boy of eight or nine years old (one of the family of Feo Belcari, a name well known in the annals of Tuscan literature,) was on his way to school, when a butterfly, or grasshopper, or some other insect, happening to cross his path, he attempted to catch it, and was

gradually led on by the chase till he found himself at this place. Here, having lost sight of the object of his pursuit, his eye was attracted by a brilliant light shining from a part of the wall, and he soon distinguished there the picture I have been describing. Riveted to the spot by the strangeness of the sight, he stood still to gaze at it; and soon the Blessed Virgin seemed to detach herself from the wall, to come down, and to leave the Child Jesus on the ground playing with the bird, which also seemed to be alive, whilst she herself disappeared to the interior of the prison, and filled it with a brilliant light, such as far transcended the brilliancy even of an Italian summer noon. Presently she came back, took the Child again into her arms, and returned to her former place, where her eyes and mouth appeared to open and close, tears to fall from her eyelids, and the whole colour and expression of her face frequently to change. After some hours, the boy ran home and told this strange tale to his mother; but she, believing him to be only inventing false excuses for a guilty absence from school, gave him his dinner, and sent him back again. Of course, he returned to the same spot, where he still saw the same appearances. Once more he went home to call his mother; but she refused to come, gave him a good scolding, and desired him to go to school. It was not to be expected that he should really obey this order; and again, therefore, we find him on the same spot, watching until a late hour in the evening all those remarkable changes in the countenance of the Madonna which still continued. At length a priest passed by, and seeing the boy alone in that solitary place at so late an hour, suspected him of some mischievous purpose. He called him, therefore, to rebuke him; but when he had heard his story, he turned back to look and examine for himself. He was immediately satisfied of the truth of the boy's statement; and being, as it happened, a priest of considerable dignity — Father John Celmi, at that time the Bishop's vicar-general, — people soon flocked together to witness what they had heard reported on such credible authority. Crowds of persons came even on that very night, and saw the supernatural brilliance, the opening and shutting of the eyes, the dropping of the tears, and the changing hues of the countenance. The accumulated rubbish of 130 years was soon cleared away, lamps and other offerings were suspended to the wall, and the whole place began to assume the appearance of a house of God. Every day, from the 6th of July till the 10th of August, these miraculous appearances were continued, and thousands of people, many of whom came from very distant parts, were eye-witnesses of the fact, just as has hap-

pened recently also in the case of Rimini. On the 10th of August they ceased; but were renewed again in October, and on the Feast of St. Leonard in November; and again in the months of February, March, and April of the following year; and lastly, on the 6th of July, the first anniversary.

The subsequent history of the Sanctuary is like that of most others,—offerings were made for the erection of a church; a three days' fast, with sermons on the first and third day, was ordered before the laying of the foundation-stone. It was begun with great pomp and ceremony on the 18th of October, 1485; all the clergy and religious confraternities, as well as the magistrates, took part in it; and there was a procession of 2000 women and of 1200 girls, varying in age from five years to twenty, all clothed in white, and bearing garlands of olive on their heads. The work was completed in the year 1491; and the original painting on the wall was left untouched, where it still remains, the same object of public reverence and devotion as it has been during the whole of the last three centuries and a half. Persons who had received special graces before this picture used to walk to St. Stephen's with garlands of flowers on their heads, to offer their vows of thanksgiving at the altar of *Santa Maria della Cintola*; and children who were baptised in St. Stephen's were brought to the *Madonna delle Carceri* (of the prisons—the name of this new church) to have the sign of the cross made over them with one of those pieces of silk that had been used to wipe off the tears in the first miraculous manifestation of this picture in 1484. In a word, these two Sanctuaries have uniformly divided, or rather multiplied, the devotion of the people of Prato and its neighbourhood towards the Queen of Heaven. We have already seen how ardent is still the popular devotion to *Santa Maria della Cintola*; and as a proof that neither is the devotion to the *Madonna delle Carceri* yet extinct, we need only mention that within the last fifteen years it has received the offering of the golden crown, annually awarded by the Chapter of the Vatican.

N.

EXTEMPORE PREACHING.

OUR attention has been kindly called to a paragraph in the *Rambler* for September last, which has been thought likely (in one or more quarters) to foster a notion that a Catholic

priest, as such, has no need to prepare the sermons he preaches. The paragraph in question runs as follows: "The preaching of the various sects of Protestants is perhaps the most striking which can be selected; and in no other instance is the *safety* which the study of scholastic theology confers on the Catholic priesthood more manifest than in the difference between Catholic and Protestant sermons. A Catholic priest can *trust himself* to preach without writing his sermon beforehand, and if necessity calls, with scarcely a few minutes' forethought. If he is only duly prepared for his work by a sound education, and has stored his mind, and strengthened what we may call his theological faculties by the diligent study of the great writers of the Church, he will no more talk nonsense, or heresy, or weary his readers with dull repetitions, or hesitate for matter on which to speak, than a sensible and educated man of the world will talk like a child, a lunatic, or a country clown, on matters of secular interest."

On reflection, we cannot but think that the words we thus used are really correct. Still, we are anxious to take the earliest opportunity of repeating the qualifications which we made at the time to our general statement. It will be observed, that the utmost we said was, that a Catholic priest might safely preach "with scarcely a few minutes' forethought, *if necessity called*;" that is, of course, the necessity of *duty*. It never could be expected that a necessity which was the consequence of indolence, of carelessness in making the most of time of leisure hours, or of a general mismanagement of the intellectual or moral faculties, would be followed by an extempore sermon such as *all* sermons ought to be. It is only when the imperative demands of the sacerdotal office *compel* a clergyman to speak with scarcely any preparation, that he can calculate upon such a Divine blessing in the utterance of a sermon as may be reasonably looked for when he has neglected no means of preparation which really lay within his reach.

Still more, we introduced this further qualification, that to enable a man never to "talk nonsense, or heresy, or weary his readers with dull repetitions, or hesitate for matter on which to speak," it is necessary that he should be "duly prepared for his work by a sound education," and should have "*stored his mind, and strengthened what we may call his theological faculties by the diligent study of the great writers of the Church.*" Without such *thorough* study—for it will be noted that it is no superficial training which we presuppose in the preacher—it is obvious that nothing less than a miracle will generally enable a priest to preach tolerably well at a few

minutes' notice, whenever called upon. Such miraculous aid he has clearly no right to look for, even if the necessity of unprepared preaching be the result of the strictest performance of his other duties.

Again, after all, we did not imply that, even under these special conditions, the average class of minds who are called to the sacred office could hope to preach what are often called *good* sermons, *i.e.* not merely orthodox, sensible, intelligible, and devout, but striking, and more than ordinarily excellent as compositions. It is very possible to avoid "nonsense," "heresy," and "dull repetitions," and never to "hesitate for matter on which to speak," and yet to preach a very dull discourse. The case appears to be exactly parallel to what is daily seen in secular matters. Of a thoroughly educated man we cannot, indeed, say precisely the same as was said of Swift, of whom a great critic declared, that "he could write finely, even on such a subject as a broomstick." Yet, cultivate properly the general faculties of any person of average abilities, and store his mind with a sufficiency of knowledge of the subject on which he has to speak, and you will find that at any time—provided he is reasonably self-possessed—he will express himself without discredit, that he will have something sensible to say, and that however defective he may be in eloquence or fluency of words, he will be supplied with matter for his discourse. Yet perhaps he will be far enough from speaking *well* in the eyes of the critical, though the majority of his hearers may be both pleased and instructed by what he says.

Considering, then, how boundless is the field of subject which lies before a Catholic preacher from which to supply himself with matter, even at a moment's notice, and how extensive and deep has been the study which we have presupposed him to have gone through; recollecting, further, that preaching is a *frequent* work with him, so that he must necessarily have attained a tolerable degree of self-possession and fluency; and lastly, implying—as we necessarily implied—that his whole soul is absorbed in his work, and that he is conscious that he is uttering the word of God to his people, and not—after the Protestant fashion—letting off a discourse consisting of his own views; we cannot but think that *under the circumstances* such a result as we have supposed may be fairly looked for. At the same time, we trust that what we have stated will not be taken to imply more than it strictly means; and we venture to hope that any who may have taken exception at our first statement will concur in it as now more fully expanded.

Reviews.

THE POPE.

The See of St. Peter, the Rock of the Church, the Source of Jurisdiction, and the Centre of Unity. By Thomas William Allies, M.A., author of "The Church of England cleared from the Charge of Schism." Burns and Lambert.

The Pope: considered in his Relations with the Church, Temporal Sovereignities, Separated Churches, and the Cause of Civilisation. By Count Joseph de Maistre. Translated by the Rev. Æneas M'D. Dawson. Dolman.

It will sound like a paradox in many ears, but yet we venture to express our conviction that there is something peculiarly suited to the English mind in the doctrine of the Papal Supremacy. We do not say, indeed, that it will be acceptable to Englishmen in every detail of their character. It will not please their haughtiness; it will not please their selfishness; but it will please their practical common sense. Make an Englishman a thoroughly religious man, and convince him that Almighty God has actually given a revelation of supernatural truths, a belief in which is necessary to salvation, and his common sense will turn to the Pope as the needle to the pole.

For if there is any one quality by which the genuine Englishman is distinguished from men of other countries, it is his passion for what seems practical. He argues on all subjects by a method unlike that of other races. The logic, the historical inquiries, the poetry, the romance, the devout aspirations, the metaphysical speculations, which, in various combinations, exert so powerful an influence on the continental mind, for the most part go for little or nothing with our island countrymen. They ask one question when any theory is proposed to them. "How does it answer?" is all they have to say. If it answers, they adopt it; if it does not answer, reasons why it *should* answer, and *will* answer, they account a profitless theorising. Hence that singular phenomenon which the English nation presents to the eyes of foreigners. Hence that union of independence and obedience to the laws which constitutes our national safeguard against the prevailing revolutionism of the age. Hence the belief in Acts of Parliament as something all but divine. Hence the discipline in our army and navy, a discipline to which spirits the wildest and most rebellious in politics and religion, submit with willingness, as

to a necessity for the achievement of victory. Hence the "satisfaction" with which the "public" has received the Privy Council's decree against the Bishop of Exeter. And hence the innumerable examples which our private and public life presents, in which we forget the past, ignore the future, and live only in the present. What *was*, is a piece of antiquarianism; what *is to be*, is a speculation; what *is*, is the only question of practical moment. And therefore, for three hundred years the most independent people in Europe have abjectly acquiesced in the Royal Supremacy; and for the same reason, if Almighty God grants them grace to learn their own sins, and to believe that Jesus Christ has revealed his will to man, they will flee to the Pope as their spiritual guide and sovereign.

That Englishmen in general are troubled with any very grievous historical or theological difficulties respecting the Papal Supremacy, we do not believe. Their difficulties are chiefly those of absolute ignorance. It is not that they understand the Catholic doctrine respecting the Pope, and yet reject it. In their hearts, the enormous majority of the English nation no more *believe* the Pope to be Antichrist, than they believe him to be Emperor of China. They are tormented with two or three historico-theological bugbears, which warp their faculties whenever they think (to use a complimentary word) on the matter; but the prevailing Anglican, Evangelical, and Dissenting cant about Antichrist, and the "pure word of God," and the Church "before the division of east and west," has no hold whatsoever either upon the heart or the intellects of the great bulk of the people. They know that certain Protestants were once burnt in Smithfield by Queen Mary and Bishops Gardiner and Bonner. They fancy that if a man acknowledges the Pope, he thereby becomes a slave, who may be forced some day to believe that two and two make five, and that the earth is square. They have a sort of dreamy horror of monks and Jesuits, and think of convents as the very antipodes of their own "domestic temple," that is, their comfortable firesides. But as to sharing the theological horrors of their own clergy, or really hating the doctrine of the Papal Supremacy *as such*, we no more believe that the English nation, as a body, does this, than we believe that it hates monarchy or the articles of war.

In fact, English people generally do not believe in any thing sufficiently to hate any thing else. With all the vast amount of benevolence, good feeling, respectability, and (so to call it) religiousness, which prevails, there perhaps never was a period in our history when the national mind really had so little *faith* in any doctrines as being the Word of God. The

land echoes, indeed, till we are deafened, with the watchwords of various parties. Texts fly about in church and in chapel, in drawing-room and on platform, in book and in periodical. Sentiments about religion were never more universal since the Reformation than in this very year. Yet after all, those who are even slightly interested about religion are the minority; and of these a singularly small fraction can be said to believe in any thing except the powers of Parliament, the laws of physical science, the omnipotence of money, and the indefeasible rights of all Englishmen of respectability to freedom,—personal, moral, intellectual, and political. And thus it is that the bulk of the more educated commercial classes hate the Pope negatively rather than positively. They do not reject his supremacy on any directly religious grounds whatever. They abhor the notion of being themselves fettered, impoverished, and dictated to; and being possessed with a vague suspicion that all these evils would follow from an admission of the Papal claims, so far they denounce the Pope and all his supporters. On the other hand, let them be at length awakened to a sense of the inexpressibly awful deadliness of sin, and of the worth of their own souls; and at the same time let them learn what are the facts relating to the Papal supremacy, and become convinced that Almighty God has given a revelation and set up a visible Church, and instantly their natural tendency will be to accept the Papal claims *as a practical and immediate solution of all their difficulties*.

Let us follow, however, the course of such a mind a little in detail, and trace its steps as it arrives at a recognition of the Pope's authority. Let us suppose the case of an ordinary English gentleman or tradesman, of shrewd independent faculties, who has hitherto contentedly acquiesced in the popular platitudes of the day, himself persuaded that, after all, it matters little what is a man's creed, provided his life be practically right. Impelled by some outward influence, by some book, or sermon, or casual remark, or sudden illness, or frightful calamity, a conviction at length grows upon his mind that the unseen world is a reality, and that his own future condition after death is a subject demanding immediate serious consideration. Silently, but surely, the feelings strengthen; he views Almighty God no longer as an abstraction, but as an actual ever-present Being. At the same time, a sense of his personal accountability to God springs up within him. He exchanges his notions about conformity to a moral law, for a belief that *obedience* is due to a Divine Judge and Master.

Immediately, his old theories respecting the Christian religion take a new shape, and appear for the first time to be

things of any real moment. "Is it," he asks himself, "an historical fact that the events narrated in the Bible really occurred? Is this Christianity in which I am living neither more nor less than the result of a positive revelation from the God to whom I am accountable, but whom I cannot see?" And thus, for the first time, the idea of religious *doctrines*, as such, strikes with vivid force upon his intelligence. Judging by the rules of historical evidence, he feels convinced that Jesus Christ did indeed once live on earth, and that most undeniably He taught *something* to his followers as a revelation from God. What that might be which He taught is a further question. That He taught *something* can be denied by no man who is not prepared to disbelieve the evidence of his senses, and to deny that Mahomet, Luther, or Julius Cæsar ever existed. This he *cannot* doubt.

Then, it may be, a frightful suspicion crosses his mind: "If Mahometanism is false, why not also Christianity? Of the whole human race, only about one-third believes in the *truth* of Christianity. Was Jesus Christ, then, authorised by the invisible Creator of mankind to declare his will to his creatures?" As we are not now establishing the truth of Christianity, we have no need to shew how our inquirer convinces himself that our Blessed Lord Jesus Christ is really to be obeyed as a teacher sent from God. We only suppose that such is his conclusion, and that he proceeds to attempt to realise the consequences of this tremendous truth. "If God *has* spoken," he continues, "*what* has He said?" Immediately his mind is opened to a certainty, that the bewildering theological conflicts of the day are not a mere strife of words. Often, perhaps, as he seeks a clue from out the tangled labyrinth, he is *tempted* to persuade himself that they *are* nothing more than a senseless logomachy; and that to ensure a happy eternity, it is sufficient to pay a general reverence to Jesus Christ as a mysterious and divine Being. But no such conclusion really satisfies him. To suppose that an edifice like Christianity, of eighteen hundred years' duration, and embracing unnumbered millions of souls, is literally based upon *nothing*, is too palpable an absurdity to be tolerated by any man with open eyes and a determinedly earnest heart.

Where, then, is the source whence a knowledge of what Jesus Christ taught is to be attained? Our inquirer, being an Englishman, conceives that the sure way to try the various professing modes for learning religious truth is actually to put them to the test. A theory that will not hold water for a moment is clearly worthless. He therefore proceeds to examine what are the results of the application of the theological

nostrums whose praises he hears on every side. Naturally enough, he turns first to the Bible. Here, at least, is a record which all but an insignificant minority of Anglo-German religionists agree in accounting to be true. This book which he holds in his hands, though nearly eighteen hundred years old, is absolutely the Word of God. Thus far he proceeds on the concurrent testimony of those who are called Christians. As all are unanimous on this point, and as he is proceeding by the road of common sense, gradually informing itself as to facts, he conceives himself justified in accepting "the Bible" as a record, if not as the only record, of the teaching of the Founder of Christianity.

Instantly, however, difficulties beset him. *Two* Bibles are before him: which of the two is *the* Bible, written by inspiration of God? As to the innumerable varieties in the Greek and Hebrew text, and in the various ancient and modern versions, these he does not think it necessary to inquire into. In the present state of his information, he has not advanced far enough to appreciate their discrepancies; and he sees that, if they differ in many things, they agree in many more. Nor does he imagine that he is bound, at least at present, to identify himself, as an inquirer, with other inquirers who cannot read, and to whom, therefore, the study of the Bible is practically impossible. He is asking what is right in his own case, and in his own case alone; and these refinements of polemics (as they seem) he sets aside. But one difficulty he cannot set aside: Which is the Bible sanctioned by Almighty God, the Catholic Bible or the Protestant Bible? The former contains many more books than the latter: are the Protestants justified in rejecting the claims of the deuterocanonical writings? Here is a preliminary inquiry, on which he must pause awhile. He buys various works on the "Apocrypha," Catholic and Protestant, and is speedily plunged into the depths of the controversy. Every step he takes compels him to take a further step. Fresh subjects open up at every turn. Before he has half completed the reading of what is already before him, he perceives that to study the question thoroughly, that is, honestly, will occupy half his life, supposing he lives to be an old man; and what if he dies in the course of a year or two! The extent of historical reading which is required for the verification of the statements he finds made on both sides, is impossible for an ordinary person. There must be some other broad path open before him, in which he will find his difficulties diminish, and not increase, the farther he proceeds.

However, he is content to wave the difference between

the Protestant and the Catholic Bible, and proceeds to the investigation of the writings which are common to both. A few hours throw him into difficulties to which the question of the "Apocrypha" is a trifle. Is the Bible *all* inspired in the same sense of the term? Is every word of it literally and eternally true? If so, is it necessary to believe that the sun goes round the earth, and that the creation of the universe was completed in six times four-and-twenty hours, not to mention a long catalogue of historical and critical difficulties? Still further, bewildered as he is by the use of a phraseology which, however common in sermons and religious books, is nevertheless full of expressions to which the visible world (the only world which, as yet, he knows) presents no correlatives, he nevertheless meets with many statements sufficiently intelligible to add to his general confusion. He finds certain writings referred to which are no longer in existence; unrecorded works of the Divine Author of Christianity alluded to as innumerable in number; and in one place one of the chief writers drawing a distinction between what he speaks himself and what the Lord speaks. All this forces upon him the entire subject of the inspiration of the Scriptures. Granting that the Gospel narratives are true, as narratives, and consequently that they correctly record the words as well as the actions of Jesus Christ, how does the general acquiescence of all Christians in the genuineness and authenticity of the New Testament prove the inspiration of all its writers? What is meant when it is said that St. Paul and St. John were inspired? How do we know they were inspired, in any sense? The unanimous consent of Christians to the circumstance that the New Testament is true as a narrative is a ground for believing it, because the question involved is one of mere matter of fact, cognisable by the senses, and within the province of human testimony. Not so with inspiration. To allege that all Christians *say* that St. Paul was instructed by God to write his epistle, is just nothing. How do Christians know this? Inspiration is not a thing to be seen and handled with the eyes and hands. There is no proof that St. Paul even said himself that the greater part of his letters was inspired. Why should not all Christians be deceived in a matter not cognisable by the senses? The whole world has been thus deceived repeatedly before. Until recently, no one believed that the blood circulated throughout the human body. At length a man was born, who put together the facts which his senses shewed him; and now every educated man no more doubts the circulation of the blood than he doubts his own existence. What is the opinion of the whole

human race worth on a subject beyond the province of its faculties?

But let all these difficulties pass, and suppose that our inquirer assumes that it is right to take up the Protestant Bible, and learn a creed from its pages, believing every thing to be inspired which he does not himself conceive to be contradicted by modern science. What is the result? First of all, a hopeless entanglement of his faculties in a labyrinth of difficult texts. If here and there a sentence or a chapter seems clear, and a certain interpretation undeniable, these cases are exceptional. Being a clear-sighted man, he rigorously binds himself to an *independent* inquiry. He will tolerate no dictation from any quarter. Why should he pay heed to the Thirty-nine Articles, or the book of Common Prayer, or to the creeds, or to the theories of Luther, Calvin, or Wesley? Who are all these popular preachers of the day, that they should prescribe to his private intellect a certain scheme of theology, and persuade him that all the passages in the Bible which this theory seems to contradict are comparatively worthless? It is clear to him that not one of all the Protestant sects can account for the existence of a vast number of the texts he reads. *They* think nothing of shelving long sentences, but *he* can consent to no such dishonesty. It is no satisfaction to him to be informed that such and such passages are "very difficult," "very mysterious," "only to be understood by the spiritually-minded." He has a shrewd sense of imposture, when he sees professed Bible-worshippers coolly instituting an invidious contrast between one class of texts and another, and insinuating that his own worldly-mindedness is the only reason why he thinks an equal value ought to be set upon the texts which the "enlightened" love, and upon those which they pass by as leavened with something unsound and unclean. In his own personal criticisms, the knowledge of these disingenuous proceedings serves only to add to his perplexities. The more he reads, the more he perceives that he has to learn; the more he thinks, the more hopeless appears the task he has undertaken.

Then he turns to the religious creeds and parties about him, and setting aside private speculations, asks for some proof of the utility of the private-judgment theory in actual realised results. Being a modest man, and not given to believe in his own infallibility, he is disposed to give other persons credit for consistency, and thinks that, after all, the fault may be with himself. "Surely," he says, "there *must be* something in the view of so many respectable and excellent

persons. If they all agree in telling me that the Bible is clear on all points necessary to salvation, I must suppose that they mean what they say, and know what they mean." Being also, as we are supposing, a practical man, he conceives that his right course will be to proceed as in any similar circumstance in secular affairs, and inquire of the writers of books and preachers of sermons, what they *do* mean. Written words he knows are often susceptible of various interpretations. What seems clear to one mind, to another is vague. What even seems nonsense to a superficial observer may prove to be profoundly philosophical on more accurate investigation. He adopts, therefore, the common-sense plan, and pays a round of visits to the leading divines and writers of the time, calling with careful impartiality upon Oxford and Cambridge professors, London and provincial orators, authors of elaborate publications, editors of religious journals, and even upon the most distinguished of the "bench of Bishops." As his object is not to controvert, but to learn; to discover fundamental agreement, and not to exaggerate verbal differences; he pursues a very simple and obvious method in his various interviews. He ascertains, as well as he can, what are the chief forms of doctrinal statement adopted and put forth by each person whom he visits, puts the whole into writing, and simply asks for a distinct explanation of their *complete* meaning in straightforward English language. Who can possibly object to this? he thinks, in his simplicity.

Marvellous (to him), however, is the result. He begins with five or six of the Anglican prelates, and requests their interpretation of the concluding paragraph of the Apostles' Creed: "I believe in the Holy Ghost, the holy Catholic Church, the communion of Saints, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting." On every one of the doctrines here mentioned, save the two last, he finds that the said prelates differ from one another; while even on the two last, it is broadly hinted to him by more than one of them, that the resurrection of the body is a question attended with many philosophical difficulties, and that the word "everlasting" means "*not* everlasting." As to the other articles, our inquirer's head aches before he has mastered the episcopal differences on the very first of the four; and when it comes to an exposition of what they mean by "believing in the holy Catholic Church," the only fragment of intelligible sense which he can extract from the mountain of verbiage is an assertion that it is right to belong to the Established Church of England. As to "the communion of Saints," he perceives that their only idea is, that it is just the

same as the communion of sinners, that is, no communion at all; while he is told that "the forgiveness of sins" means simply that sins are forgiven, but how, when, why, and by whom, they know not, excepting only that *they* cannot forgive sins,—a thing which our inquirer has very little difficulty in believing. From the Bishops' houses he proceeds to the study of the most celebrated Evangelical preacher of the day, and respectfully asks for an explanation of his last Sunday's sermon, of which the subject was Justification. In this sermon it had been stated, that we cannot be saved without good works, but that yet good works have nothing to do with our salvation, for that we are saved by faith only. As this *seems* to be simply nonsense, an exposition in plain phraseology is respectfully requested. A courteous reply is vouchsafed, followed by a somewhat lengthy private sermon, and a flood of texts, most of them consisting of single verses, or portions of verses. The result is nevertheless so exceedingly unsatisfactory, that, coupled with the preacher's positive assertion, that his doctrine is as plainly written in the Bible as the sun is plain in the heavens, our friend is reminded of the tricks at legerdmain of a conjuror, who substitutes one card for another before our eyes, and defies us to say how or when he effected the change. With a saddened spirit he next seeks the editors of the most dogmatic of the various religious periodicals, whose dicta he hears quoted as something quite decisive; and at every fresh visit his heart sinks deeper within him. On most subjects they all disagree; and even in stating their own "views," while each of them considers himself as alone in the right, and alone agreeing with what he calls the "Church of Christ," he cannot meet with a single individual who has so thoroughly investigated his own opinions as to bear being questioned by a shrewd and unprejudiced man. On one point they agree, but even here it is only in feeling: they agree in disliking, fearing, and hating the Church of Rome; though, strange to say, their notions as to the real character of Rome are manifold.

His last resource amongst "orthodox" schools, whether Anglican or Dissenting, is some celebrated "Anglo-Catholic" divine. He makes his selection, ascertains the abode where he is to be found, knocks at the door, sends in his card with a letter of introduction, and is ushered into an apartment, where, as chance would have it, a large number of "right-minded" men are assembled to discuss the present crisis in ecclesiastical affairs. "An excellent opportunity!" he remarks to himself; and begging that he may cause no interruption, he sits still and listens. "Here at least is uniformity of language," he

thinks; "these men certainly are agreed, and they clearly have been taught by some supreme authority. 'The Church' is *their* guide, whether rightly or wrongly." His spirits immediately rise, and at length he summons courage to propound a query. "You speak of *the* Church," he says to his neighbour; "may I take the liberty of asking to what Church you refer?" Other ears have caught his words, and a general silence ensues, while the person questioned replies with instant readiness, "The Catholic Church, of course." "The *Catholic* Church!" echoes our inquirer; "surely you do not mean the Church of Rome?" "God forbid!" cries a voice from another corner of the room; while the individual immediately addressed replies more mildly, "Surely not: I mean the Universal Church, prior to the division of east and west." Our friend is puzzled; but he collects his thoughts and says, "Pardon my dulness, but I do not catch your meaning. When you say you believe in the Universal Church of the year (say) 500, do you mean that you believe that there was a Catholic Church then, and that there is not a Catholic Church now?" "Far from it," replies the other, looking grave and suspicious; "I mean that we must believe what the Catholic Church taught then, and not what it teaches now." "My dear ——!" interposes another divine, "what *are* you saying? Not believe what the Catholic Church teaches now? Impossible!" The party in general now look bewildered and shocked, and in the brief silence that ensues, the inquirer proceeds with his deductions. "Do I understand the gentleman who spoke last to mean that we *are* to believe what the present Catholic Church teaches us?" "Certainly," responds the person appealed to. "May I ask for a definition of the *present* Catholic Church?" is the next query. "All baptised persons constitute the Church," is the reply, "whether of the Roman, Greek, or Anglican branches." "*All* baptised persons?" is the reply. "All!" respond three or four voices in decided tones. "In speaking of *all* baptised persons," continues the visitor, "I presume that German Lutherans, Scotch Presbyterians, and English Dissenters, are included. Is it so?" he continues, observing the response lingers. "No!" answers one of the party. "Yes!" cries a second. "Undoubtedly!" ejaculates a third. "Very much the reverse!" exclaims a fourth. "Unquestionably it excludes them!" interposes a fifth. "God forbid!" murmurs a sixth. "Why do you say 'God forbid'?" asks a seventh. And so on in alternate assertion and contradiction, till every man present has propounded his view. "I am sure, gentlemen, you will pardon my importunity," proceeds our inquirer,

"but I am searching, in plain terms, for a religion; and finding it a very difficult matter to ascertain *what* Christianity consists in, I am anxious for some intelligible direction to a source from which I may learn what I seek. I see clearly that even you are not unanimous as to the *real* nature of the authority to which you profess to defer; but perhaps you may be unanimous in action and detailed doctrine, though not in your fundamental idea. Can you, then, oblige me by pointing out to me some straightforward practical method by which I may learn *what* the Divine Founder of Christianity taught his disciples? I am not a theologian, but an ordinary person. I am very much occupied by my professional duties, so that I have no time for abstruse discussions; but nevertheless, I have my natural share of common penetration, and being a practical Englishman, all I wish is to know *what* I am to believe, and *why*. I do not expect to find no difficulties, but I do expect that when once I am in the right path my difficulties will diminish, and not increase. In every method I have yet tried, the more I have studied, the more I have been puzzled; and you will pardon me if I add, that since I came into this room my difficulties have multiplied more rapidly than ever. However, I do not *wish* for difficulties; and all I ask is, that you will kindly explain matters, and refer me to the source whence you yourselves draw your religious belief."

A general silence follows. All look uncomfortable, some angry, some vexed, and some excessively confused. Receiving no immediate reply, our friend again speaks. "Perhaps," he says, "I shall make my wishes clear, and disentangle the subject, if I go back to what was said a few minutes ago. You all seem to agree that for some hundreds of years the Catholic Church was united, and taught, as well as believed, the unadulterated truth. *Where* shall I find what was then taught?" "In the creeds," a voice, as of one much relieved, quickly replies. "In *what* creeds?" "In the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds." "That is, I presume, in the Nicene Creed alone, which comprises all that the Apostles' Creed teaches." "Yes." "Then is that *all* that we know of what Jesus Christ taught?" Again a silence ensues, soon broken by a declaration that we ought to believe all that can be historically proved out of the primitive Fathers. "*Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*," murmurs another voice. "How would you advise *me*, then, to proceed?" asks our inquirer of the individual to whom his visit was specially paid. "Study the Fathers, surely," is the rejoinder. "I cannot read Latin with facility, or Greek at all." "Then study them in translations." "Are they all

translated?" "No, not yet." "Are they nearly all translated?" "Why, hardly that, I fear." "Then perhaps something very important may be omitted in the published volumes, which would appear in those not yet accessible to me." "You should consult learned and grave divines on the subject." "But are all learned and grave divines agreed? For instance, Mr. Allies, I hear, has published two books on the Papal Supremacy, containing (I am told) as nearly as possible the very same quotations from the Fathers in each of them; but in his first work he considers that these quotations disprove the Supremacy, and in the second that they prove it. I confess this is a puzzle to me." "Poor Mr. Allies is sadly fallen indeed," sighs the host; "but he is only one person, and the whole body of the Anglo-Catholic Church is against him; that is, all right-minded, *true* Anglo-Catholics are against him." "I am afraid, gentlemen, I shall seem very rude," pursues our friend, "but you will excuse my urgency when so momentous a matter is at stake; supposing *you* were all to change your opinions like Mr. Allies;—you *might* do it. Mr. Allies once thought he never would do so, yet here he is, a Roman Catholic at last. In saying this, I presume you all agree with Mr. Allies in his original views. Is it so?" "I do," answers one. "I do not," exclaims another. And to our inquirer's utter amazement, the same division of opinions which so astonished him on Dissenting and Lutheran baptism is again repeated. Not yet thoroughly disheartened, however, he insinuates a query, which elicits from the majority of the persons present a confession that, so far from having themselves studied all the Fathers, they have read only a few fragments of their writings; while two or three admit that they never read a single entire work of any Father whatsoever.

"Well," continues the pertinacious visitor, "these may be, after all, critical trifles; and, as I have said, I am only a practical man. I look to the broad results. Theological niceties and historical inquiries I leave to the professional divine. The only right I reserve to myself, and that, I suppose, even the Pope would allow me,—is the right of questioning. This, it seems to me, is the only thing which is really and honestly in the power of the generality of Christians. They cannot argue; they cannot study; but they *can* exert their common sense, and say, What do you mean? what am I to believe? what are the *facts* which you have met with in your historical pursuits? Now, then, I will take the liberty of repeating a statement which, I am told, is made by the Romanists; and if you, gentlemen, can either explain it away, or prove the contradictory, or advance a parallel fact of

equal importance on your side, I am prepared to overlook a great deal of what appear to me to be your inconsistencies. The fact I allude to is this. The Romanists say, that the whole line of Popes, from the first Pope until Pius IX., have all held and taught identically the same creed. If this is so, I confess that it strikes me as a fact of which the importance cannot be overrated. It will not prove the Romish religion true, nor will it overcome my English hatred of despotism and priestcraft, but it will remain an unexplained phenomenon in the history of man; and unless some other parallel fact can be set up in favour of Anglo-Catholicism, I shall never believe that Anglo-Catholicism is other than a delusion." "I deny the fact," is the instant response from several voices. "Forgive the liberty I take," pursues their interrogator, "but I must refer my questions solely to those who have diligently studied the whole history of the Christian Church. May I ask you, sir," turning to his host, "whether you can prove that the modern Popes teach doctrines different from the ancient Popes?" "Undoubtedly I can." "On what subjects, may I ask? For instance, on the Invocation of Saints and on the Real Presence?" "On both of them. There exists no proof whatsoever that the early Bishops of Rome either invoked the Saints or believed in Transubstantiation." "But is there any proof that they *disbelieved* these doctrines? Can you mention any one of the whole series who said that it is *wrong* to invoke the Saints, and that the substance of bread and wine remains after consecration?" "Not precisely that; but there is no need to shew that they thought invocation wrong, in order to prove that they did not hold it. The absence of proof that they did hold it is sufficient." "Excuse me, my dear sir, but there is need of this. You surely do not mean to tell me that you can find historical contemporary testimony, of a trustworthy character, from which you can prove all the details of the Faith of each of the ancient Bishops of Rome, such as you yourself admit it to have been? You say, I conclude, that they believed in the Holy Trinity. But where is the contemporary proof?" "There is no need of contemporary proof when the Nicene Council asserted solemnly that this had been the faith of the Church from the first." "No doubt they *asserted* it, and *said* that they had proof, both written and traditional, to support their assertion. But so the Council of Trent *asserted* the same respecting Invocation, Transubstantiation, and all the other Romish doctrines. Or do you mean that the Council of Nice had *written* proofs, and that the Council of Trent had not? Did they not, *both* of them, professedly rely on an unwritten

tradition? This, therefore, is what I want explained: how do you shew that the early Popes believed in the doctrine of the Holy Trinity by any better proofs than the assertions at Nice, while you refuse credit to similar assertions at Trent?" "The Council of Trent was not an œcumenical council, and therefore might be deceived." "That is not the point we are discussing: the Council of Trent called itself infallible, and the Council of Nice called itself infallible also, and in both cases certain parties denied the title claimed; but what has this to do with the historical proof of the doctrines held by individual Popes? You say the Popes have changed their doctrines, and that the ancient Popes *denied* Invocation, Transubstantiation, and so forth. Again I say, where is the proof? Did the Council of Nice say that they denied these doctrines? All I require is a satisfactory historical document on which I can lay my finger, and say, Here is a proof that such and such a Pope *rejected* such a Romish dogma. I know well enough that there exist no documents expounding at length the creeds of all the Popes downwards. Yet we all agree that they all *did* believe a great many unrecorded doctrines; therefore I conclude that they *may* have believed all the modern Roman creed, though neither they themselves nor their contemporaries have recorded it. Again I repeat, shew me the document which asserts that St. Peter, or St. Clement, or St. Leo, or any Pope whatsoever, believed that the substance of the bread and wine is *not* changed by the consecration of the priest."

We need not detail the replies to this very natural request. They may be easily conceived; or rather, it may be easily conceived that no real reply followed. We must accompany our inquirer in his reflections, as, excessively confounded and somewhat disgusted at the result of his conference, he proceeds with his researches, and examines the alternatives yet remaining to him. "It is, in truth," he whispers to himself, "a portentous fact, a *most* portentous fact, this apparent unity of creed for eighteen centuries; for certainly the balance of proof in favour of the unchanged nature of the Roman creed is much more than the proof against it. In fact, there is no proof at all that the Papal belief is *altered*; there is only a deficiency of contemporary proof as to what the Popes did hold on the points in dispute; and this deficiency is just nothing, for it is undeniable that they held many things equally unrecorded at the time. I can understand the Romish theory. It may be false, but still it holds water. I can understand how, in a vast complicated system, it might take hundreds of years for the accidents of events to produce

a written narrative of the whole system in all its workings ; but I cannot understand how, if the Popes *changed* their creed, there should be no record to say so, nothing to prove that the old Popes positively denied the faith of the modern Popes. These Anglo-Catholics, as far as I comprehend, say that the Popes have added to the ancient creed. But that is a pure inference. A man may seem to be adding to his opinions when he is merely adding to my knowledge of them. If he tells me that he always held the same, I must take him at his word, unless I can shew from his past sayings that he once held the very reverse. Certainly, this fact about the Papacy is marvellous, whatever be its meaning. Protestants admit that they have no parallel fact in their own favour. I can draw but one conclusion. There is a great probability that the creed of Rome always has been what it is now, and primitive Christianity is substantially identical with Romanism."

But here a fresh doubt intervenes. What if, after all, this whole historical creed is but a figment, a mere eighteen-hundred years' delusion ; and Romanism, Anglo-Catholicism, and "orthodox" Protestantism, are all dreams together ? What, if the Rationalist view is true, and Jesus Christ taught nothing but morals ? That such a supposition would naturally occur to the person whose course we are picturing can scarcely be doubted. At first sight, it would *seem* to him to furnish just the practical severing of the knot that would silence his speculations, if not convince his judgment. Still, the mighty phenomenon of the Christian Church appals him. It passes all his powers of credulity to receive *as a certainty* the theory that the whole Christian world, with its unnumbered millions of millions, for eighteen consecutive centuries, in every clime and throughout every stage of civilisation and barbarism, should have suffered itself to be deceived as to the historical fact on which their faith has ever rested. For be it observed, that it is as certain a fact as any which the whole range of history presents, that the whole Christian Church, and all persons calling themselves Christians, till within a few years ago, unanimously agreed that the Author of their religion did teach *some* dogmatic statements, which his followers accepted as a distinct revelation of truths from God, and not as mere moral precepts. Can any rational mind, then, rest satisfied with an hypothesis which starts with the assumption that every follower of Jesus Christ, from his own time until now, was wrong in this supposition ? Is it credible that the twelve Apostles, St. Paul, and all the first Christians, laboured under a delusion when they considered that their Master's teaching

was not a mere allegorical system of morality, but a revealing of the nature, will, and actions of Almighty God? Which is the more credible, that the Papal system should be a faithful transcript of that revelation, or that no revelation at all should have been conveyed by Jesus Christ? Modern Rationalists, we are aware, accept the latter alternative as thoroughly accordant with right reason. *How* they do this, we must confess it passes our imagination to conceive. But that the average class of Englishmen, gifted with clear heads, earnest and determined hearts, and ordinary information, will *generally* take up with this fantastic scheme, we account to be very nearly an impossibility. If they become not Catholics, they will not ultimately content themselves with honouring Christianity and the Bible, even in name. They may indeed clothe our adorable Lord in a purple robe, and put a sceptre in his hand, and crown his royal head; but the crown will be of thorns, the sceptre will be a mocking reed, and they will tear off the robe to drag him with insults to Calvary. As for such a man as we are supposing our inquirer to be, he may be struck, confounded, and bewildered for a while, by the temptation to deride all creeds together; but if he continues his reflections, and still more, his prayers, the recollection of the continued existence of the one great body of the Roman Church, and its line of Pontiffs, will haunt him day by day, and forbid him to rest until he has investigated her claims to his submission.

Thus, at last, a very simple device occurs to him, and he is astonished that a practical person like himself should not have thought of it before. Why should he not do in the case of the Catholic doctrine what he has done for the Protestant? Every Protestant theory he has taken on trial, at its own word, and on its own professions; surely, common justice and common prudence require the same test to be applied to the pretensions of Rome. Will Rome break down on trial, like Geneva, Augsburg, and Oxford? Is the Roman theory a paper theory only, or one that works, and turns out what its advocates profess it to be? How, then, shall he ascertain this? Surely, by the same experimental test which he has already applied to Protestantism. He has read Protestant books, heard Protestant sermons, and tried to comprehend the Bible on the Protestant principle, and in vain. The more he has read, thought, and listened, the more helpless he has found himself. Then he has betaken himself to individual Protestants of all kinds and of the highest reputation; and the gloom has thickened into tenfold darkness. Clearly, the Protestant theory is false, because the more you depend upon it, the more

inextricable is the entanglement into which you are betrayed. Does Rome, then, treat you in like manner? Do her fair professions vanish like the dew before the sun? or can she claim that without which all professions are a glaring hypocrisy, namely, a unity of creed, and an intelligible exposition of what that creed is? To the trial, then, our friend proceeds.

The first results seem any thing but promising. After some deliberation, he resolves not to weary himself with much reading of Catholic books, or attending at Catholic services. Experience has taught him that the *ultimate* test must be an inquiry at the lips of living men and women; and having heard much of the peculiar authority of the priesthood in the Roman Church, he resolves at once to question the very first ecclesiastic he can meet with. Like a true Briton, nursed in a belief of the wickedness of Romish priests, he shrinks from the task with the usual undefinable dread of evil; but he is no coward, and he braces himself for the task. *Fortes fortuna juvat*; and that very day, on entering a second-class railway-carriage for a long journey, he perceives a party of persons already seated, one of them a strangely habited individual, with the hair shaved off the crown of his head, another dressed in a peculiarly-cut suit of black, and the rest looking much like average respectable gentlemen. The latter are reading newspapers, and the two former have each a little book in their hands, and seem to be mumbling (as he calls it) certain words to themselves, ever and anon reading their books and turning from one page to another, backwards and forwards, and at certain intervals shutting their eyes while their lips still move, with an expression of countenance perfectly new in our friend's experience, and of which he cannot determine whether it is puritanical, business-like, saint-like, happy, hypocritical, or sincere. "What strange people these must be!" he says to himself; and while he is watching them from the corner of his eyes, one of the two puts his book in his pocket, mutters a few more words, and then looks out of the window. The other shortly performs a similar ceremony, closing his book and muttering to himself, and almost simultaneously the rest of the party fold up their newspapers. After a few trivial remarks, a very animated conversation commences, which makes our traveller lift up his eyebrows with astonishment. On every topic that is started, each individual of the party seems to have an opinion of his own. The exact nature of the subjects discussed is a mystery to our traveller. They seem, however, to be all more or less ecclesiastical and theological, now and then verging upon questions of the profoundest importance, while the names of bishops, priests, and

even of saints, are freely introduced, as supporting or opposing one or other of the opinions advanced. By and by the conversation turns upon continental Catholic affairs, and the allusions boldly made to ecclesiastical disputes, jealousies among religious orders, condemned books of theology, and even to cases of scandalous conduct among persons of influence, reduce our friend to a point of amazement almost resembling stupor. Really, he reflects within himself, if these are Catholics, they are ten times worse than Protestants; I never heard such differences expressed in the whole course of my life till now. After a while he resolves to speak; but the train stops, the party jump out, run after their luggage,—priest, monk, and all,—and our traveller is left to his meditations.

For several minutes his reflections take an extremely Protestant turn, when gradually a feeling comes over his mind, that in some way or other the disputes he has been listening to were very different in kind from the dissensions among the Protestants at whose hands he has sought for information. He tries to analyse the difference, but can make little of it; and before the journey is over, he resolves to call upon a Catholic priest in the very town he is about to enter. In the course of the day he proceeds to put his intention into execution, finds his way to the quarter where the chapel is situated, and seeing a shop-window with Catholic books for sale, enters and inquires his way. The bookseller and a customer are in conversation, and our friend waits and turns over the publications on the counter. He takes up a pamphlet narrating the progress of a dispute between a Catholic Bishop and one of his clergy, in which the latter accuses the former in round terms of conduct the reverse of episcopal and paternal, and threatens an appeal to the Pope. As he turns over the edifying pages, from which he gathers that the Bishop was in the right, he is attracted by the dialogue between the bookseller and his customer, which waxes in interest and fervour. They are clearly differing as to certain devotions recently introduced into the town; and the visitor is further extremely angry with certain publications which he characterises as indiscreet, unfitted for English readers, calculated to scandalise Protestants, and, in fact, tending to heresy and idolatry. All this promises ill for our inquirer's satisfaction; but he proceeds, ascertains the priest's house, presents himself, and is courteously received. A long conversation ensues, of which the result is briefly this: that our friend makes up his mind to visit a large number of Catholic clergy, to go to convents and monasteries, and examine matters for himself. The priest tells him that he may confidently expect to find real unity of faith in all the

numerous doctrines which the Church has defined; that the differences of opinion he has heard are on subjects which the Church has hitherto left open; and that whatever may be the theoretical opinions of Catholics of different schools, he will learn that in actual practice they will all submit to the decision of the Pope, on any subject whatsoever, whether doctrinal, moral, or disciplinary. If this be the real result, he confesses that it will almost convince him. It is just what he wants. It is a practical solution of difficulties. To such a Church he *can* yield obedience.

To his labours he accordingly betakes himself. He journeys north, south, east, and west, and always with one result. Of Catholic disagreements and Catholic infirmities he sees enough, and more than enough; and he sees also much that edifies him, and much which he is convinced might appear to be eminently holy and Christian, if he could familiarise himself with its character. But above all, he finds it impossible to deny that the faith of Catholics is at once one and intelligible. The further he proceeds, the more he understands. The more he thinks, the less become his difficulties. Knowledge does not, as on all Protestant principles, appear to add to his perplexities. The more he sees of Catholics, the plainer is their fundamental agreement on all things of importance. Their infirmities are on the surface; the closer he examines them, the brighter shine their merits. Some strike him as saints; many as very excellent, self-denying Christians; still more as honest and sincere, though imperfect and weak, both in morals and intellect; but on the whole, he sees that the popular Protestant accusations are utterly groundless, and that most undeniably they possess not only a theoretical but a living and practical unity of faith and discipline. Above all, the fearlessness with which they challenge inquiry, and even refer him to individual Catholics, of whom they themselves entertain no high opinion, for proofs of the oneness of their creed, strikes his English heart with admiration; and he acknowledges that, whether they are right or wrong, they are just what they profess to be, while no Protestant system whatsoever is the same in profession and in fact. Everywhere he finds, further, that this marvellous unity in faith, with its accompaniment of diversity in matters not of faith, is attributed by Catholics to their recognition of the Papal Supremacy. He never hears two opinions on the point. It is the Pope who settles all. Gallicans and Ultra-Montanes, Englishmen and foreigners, Goths and Anti-Goths, the more strict and the more lenient, the saintly and the worldly, the apple-woman and the learned theologian, with

one heart and voice attribute every thing to a recognition of the supremacy of the Pope. A united Church without a Pope, they treat as a self-evident absurdity. Christianity, without a visible and supreme head, they view in much the same light as a mathematician would view a circle said to have no centre. The thing is simply impossible, unless God had given a distinct revelation to each individual soul, which He certainly has not given.

On the whole, our practical investigator feels an attraction to so eminently business-like a system, totally unlike every thing he ever felt towards the most plausible of Protestant speculations. If only it is *true*, it is as practical as it is gloriously divine. Still he is not satisfied. He wishes to know whether, as an historical fact, the Papal Supremacy has been recognised by the Universal Church in the same practical way in which he perceives that it unquestionably is received by all living Catholics. He is well aware that the entire body of the separatist Greeks disown it in practice, though he understands that in theory even they attribute a primacy to the Bishops of Rome. This, however, will not affect the main argument in his judgment. He wants to get at the broad fact of the existence of some vast body of Christians unbroken in personal and official succession, who from the earliest times *have* thus in action submitted to the Papal judgment. It is nothing to him that the Greeks now dissent and rebel, unless it appears that they can in like manner present a complete chain of evidence against the Pontiff's claims. It is quite certain—he understands—that they can produce no parallel series of Patriarchs or Bishops, all agreeing in doctrine, which can be made to confront the long line of Popes. But still, waving that difficulty for a time, he desires to contemplate their present communion as one vast body claiming direct descent from the Apostles. What, then, is the judgment of history? Can the Greeks shew that while one vast portion of the Church acquiesced and gloried in the claims of Rome, another vast portion, contemporary with the former, disputed those claims as a matter of doctrine, and as a matter of fact refused obedience to the Pontifical decisions? And thus we have brought our inquirer to Mr. Allies' last publication. *The See of St. Peter* is just that clear, broad, and boldly sketched picture of the course of early Church history, which will convince any straightforward examiner, not only that the Pope was ever admitted to be supreme in action and judgment, but that the Greeks themselves have been among the foremost to exalt and submit to his claims.

Many of our readers are aware that, some few years ago,

Mr. Allies wrote a very elaborate treatise, termed *The Church of England cleared of the Charge of Schism*. Its object was to prove that though the Christian Church in the ages anterior to the Greek schism admitted a *Primacy* in the Roman Pontiff, they refused him a *Supremacy*. This theory was made to subserve the cause of the Anglican Church by means of another theory, which alleged that the great principle of the English Reformation was a rejection of this Supremacy, as a tyrannical usurpation and a virtual denial of the divine rights of the entire Episcopate of the Christian Church. A more singular hypothesis was never broached, and the learning of its author equalled the singularity of his views. With perfect unconsciousness of the obvious meaning of his quotations, Mr. Allies cited a long series of passages from the ancient Christian writers, which he deemed conclusive in his own favour. How powerfully they told in the very opposite direction was speedily shewn in an admirable little work, *The Unity of the Episcopate*.* To a Catholic, indeed, the cause of Mr. Allies' inability to read aright the history of the past was sufficiently clear. He never grasped the idea of the Church as a living body with a living executive *government*. He understood the ideas of an episcopal succession, and of the existence of a class of men qualified by a special ordinance to become channels of divine grace from God to man. But how this system was practically to work, how these Bishops and priests were to be directed and controlled in the *exercise* of their functions, it never occurred to him to inquire. Such, in fact, is the fundamental error of the whole school of Protestants who profess to believe in a visible Church and yet deny the supremacy of the Pope. They do not perceive that *order* and *jurisdiction* are two distinct things. They imagine that a priest or a layman is bound to obey Bishops simply as Bishops, and without reference to the question, whether any individual Bishop has jurisdiction over *him*. This, at least, they would mean, if they meant any thing practical and intelligible. The episcopal order they recognise as superior in itself to the priesthood and the diaconate; and they conclude that *therefore* a priest or deacon is bound to obey every Bishop. If their theories were realities, and not baseless speculations, designed for controversy and not for use, they would instantly perceive that they might as rationally argue that because all lawful secular rulers are to be obeyed as God's viceregents in secular things, therefore every Englishman is bound to obey all and any of the sove-

* "The Unity of the Episcopate considered," by E. H. Thompson, M.A.

reigns of the whole continent of Europe. Hence Mr. Allies was possessed with the belief, that a doctrine which placed the Pope in the position of a monarch over the entire episcopate was tantamount to a denial of the divine rights of that episcopate as the ruling body of the Christian Church. He counted the Papal Supremacy an invasion of the *order* of Bishops, and would tolerate nothing but a Papal primacy or presidentship, much the same as is delegated to the Speaker of the English House of Commons.

At length a gleam of light struck upon his eyes. A pamphlet which he published on the Gorham case delighted his Catholic friends, and gave them hopes of his conversion. He was clearly beginning to perceive that the Christian episcopate is not a paper theory, like one of the Abbé Sieyès' constitutions, but a living body, designed for incessant and united action throughout Christendom, and until the end of the world. The progress and issue of the Gorham trial was shewing to all reflecting Anglicans that four-and-twenty Bishops can never be really the head even of a "branch Church," and that a *supremacy* must exist somewhere. Just, therefore, as any Christian of the first ages, who had learnt to believe in the Papal Primacy, discovered that a real Primacy *is* a supremacy, so the Anglo-Catholics learnt that the moment their "branch Church" was compelled to act *as a body*, a supremacy, if not in a Pope, then at least in a Queen, must be called into play, and its decisions must be final.

And thus was Mr. Allies intellectually prepared to co-operate with the grace which Almighty God vouchsafed him. The prayers of many souls were at length answered. "They bring to Jesus a blind man, and they besought Him that He would touch him. And taking the blind man by the hand, He led him out of the town; and spitting upon his eyes, and laying his hands upon him, He asked him if he saw any thing. And looking up, he said, I see men, as it were trees, walking. After that again He laid his hands upon his eyes, and he began to see, and was restored, so that he saw all things clearly." Such was the healing of one more of the innumerable souls whom Almighty God has called out of darkness into his marvellous light.

The *See of St. Peter* is Mr. Allies' offering at the feet of him in whom he at length recognises "the rock of the Church, the source of jurisdiction, and the centre of unity." It is certainly one of the most remarkable books ever written by one who was not actually in possession of the blessings which communion with the true Church confers. A more masterly outline of the historical argument in favour of the

Papal Supremacy originally written in our language, we cannot at present call to mind. It opens with a brief statement of the palpable present facts of the Christian Church, and puts before the reader the existing power of the Pope, as entirely without parallel or rival in the body of persons calling themselves Christians. Then follow sections on the Scriptural proof, and on the end and office and the power of the Primacy, as testified to by Christian antiquity. To these succeed the most important portion of the whole, in which the witness of the entire primitive Church to the *supreme* character of the Primacy is shewn beyond the possibility of disproof; and the essay concludes with a contrast between the Royal Supremacy and that of St. Peter and his successors. The whole is excellently worked out; for the author has advanced not merely in logic and common sense, but in style; and a more useful manual of the historical question can scarcely be put into the hands of the ignorant or wavering. We shall quote two passages, and so commend the entire work to our readers' study.

The first is from the opening section, "On the Primacy of St. Peter as an existing power."

"Christianity is now more than eighteen hundred years old; and when we look around, we find it planted, and more or less flourishing, among all the nations of the earth which are conspicuous for their power, their knowledge, and their civilisation. This common term 'Christianity' distinguishes them broadly, but decisively, from all other nations outside of its pale. But a second glance makes it necessary to analyse this term itself; for it shews a great variety of differences in the religious belief and spiritual government of those whom we have thus classed together. About two-thirds in number of all calling themselves Christians are closely united under one head, whom they believe to be of divine institution, namely, the Bishop of Rome, the successor of St. Peter, and in one belief and one communion, of which that Bishop is the special bond. Of the remaining third part, two-thirds, again, profess a belief very nearly, save in one point, identical with the former, but distinguished in that they do not now acknowledge the Bishop of Rome as the bond of their unity, though they freely admit that he once stood at the head of that patriarchal system of government which they still maintain. These form the Oriental communion, embracing the Greek and Russian Churches. Of other eastern sects it is not necessary here to speak. The rest, forming the other third of this latter third, or one-ninth, numerically, of all Christians, may be classed together as the Protestant or Anglo-German phase of Christianity. Most deeply opposed in many of their tenets, and in their whole tone of thinking and feeling, to the last-mentioned communion, they yet agree with it in rejecting the headship of St. Peter's succes-

sor, and indeed are wont to add every contumelious epithet which language can supply to the claim of authority which he puts forth and exercises. Not, however, that this Anglo-German Christianity is united itself as to its spiritual government, or even as to its belief. For whereas in England, and partly in America, it is governed by Bishops; in Prussia and Scotland, and again in the United States, it has thrown off such control. Nor, again, that its component portions have one creed, for it has been found impossible to draw up articles of belief to which they could all agree. Nevertheless, this Anglo-German Christianity may be called one mass, for it broke off, or at least was severed, at the same time from the great communion first mentioned which still acknowledges the headship of St. Peter's successor. And with many minor diversities and gradations, it has in common certain fundamental principles; such as the entire rejection, in some portions of it, and in others the attenuation, of the doctrine of Sacramental Grace, and in all the maiming of that great sacramental system to which all the rest of Christianity adheres: and again, which is a part of the above, a denial that the spiritual government of the Church is lodged by a divine succession in certain *persons*. This idea, in some of its portions, as in Prussia, and in the Protestant sects of America, is utterly rejected; in others, as the Anglican Church, made an open question, it being notorious that part of its clergy consider such a notion a corruption of Christianity, while part as warmly maintain it to be necessary for the Church's existence. Again, all are united in rejecting the Roman view of the great mystery of the Real Presence, and of that reverence to saints which flows forth from it, such as the ascription of miraculous effects to their relics, and of such prevailing power in their intercessions, that they may lawfully and profitably be asked to pray for us. Perhaps this peculiarity of mind may be summed up in its most remarkable instance. For whereas that before-mentioned great Roman Communion, and no less the Eastern, is distinguished by a very special and wholly singular love and reverence towards the most blessed Virgin Mary, as the Mother of God our Saviour; whereas all hearts within it are so penetrated with the thought of her divine maternity, that they cannot behold our Lord in his infancy without seeing Him borne in his mother's arms; nor gaze upon Him suffering on the cross without the thought of his mother transfixed with sorrow at his feet; so that He and she are indivisibly bound together, on earth in the days of his flesh, in heaven at the right hand of God; and the mystery of our redemption, completely accomplished in Him, yet enfolds her as the instrument of his incarnation, has an office and a function for her; whereas these are daily household thoughts, and the dearest of all sympathies, in minds of the Roman and the Eastern communion, the Anglo-German phase of Christianity is quite united in looking upon this reverence and love to the Blessed Virgin as dangerous, and tending to idolatry, and derogatory to our Lord.

“On the whole, then, we may set down the actually existing

Christianity as divided into three great portions: the Roman Catholic, united in government and belief, and comprehending two-thirds of the whole; the Oriental with the Russian, and the sects parted from it; the Protestant or Anglo-German.

"At this moment, then, a variety of nations, having the most various worldly interests, and the most distinct national, moral, and political character, are united in acknowledging, as the head of their religion, the successor of St. Peter, the Bishop of Rome. And after all the divisions and conflicts of Christianity within itself, two-thirds of all professing it are still of one mind, and more than one hundred and sixty millions of souls, by the confession of an adversary, see, in the divine framework of the visible Church which holds them together, one main-spring and motive power, controlling and harmonising all the rest: in the circle which embraces them and the world, one centre, St. Peter's See, the throne of the Fisherman, built by the Carpenter's Son.

"The Anglican Church professes a belief in episcopacy. It is not unworthy of its attention, that of about eleven hundred Bishops now in the world (admitting the claim of one hundred of Anglican descent), eight hundred own allegiance to the Pope. If a general Council could sit, there would be no doubt on which side the vast majority would be. If nations could represent the Church, as at the Council of Constance, there would be as little uncertainty in the result.

"Such is the aspect of things in the present day; but Christianity numbers more than eighteen hundred years. 'Remember the days of old: consider the years of many generations. Ask thy father, and he will shew thee: thy elders, and they will tell thee.' Of eighteen hundred years let us go back three hundred and fifty, from 1850 to 1500.

"Where is the Anglo-German phase of Christianity? What nations did it number? What powers of the world did it set in motion? *It was yet to come.* Its principle, indeed, had lurked in the restless mind of Wickliffe; had seemed, and but seemed, to expire in the ashes of Huss. It was darkly and mistily agitating unquiet thoughts in England and Germany, flying, like a bird of ill omen, round the proud towers of the Church of God, or festering in corners of corruption over high powers misused. But in fixed shape and consistency, as yet *it was not.* That which now claims to be the pure and reformed Church *had no existence.* The Anglo-Saxon mind had been formed and grown up under the control of St. Peter's See: and the country of Luther still with one voice revered that Winfrid, who, from the island won to the cross by St. Gregory, went forth to his successor, begged his apostolic blessing, and planted in Mayence the crosier which he had received from Rome. The Churches of Germany and England owed to the Papal See their whole organisation, and had subsisted, the one for eight hundred, the other for nine hundred years, under that fostering power. The claim which Germany and England now reject was

then written on every page of the ecclesiastical legislation of those countries. Their first metropolitans had received their jurisdiction from the Pope; the diocese of every German and English Bishop had been defined by the Pope; the institution of every Bishop to his see had been received from the Pope; and at the most awful moment of his life, every spiritual ruler had sworn that he would uphold the See of St. Peter and its occupant, 'principem episcopalis coronæ.'

"Go back but three centuries and a half, and this ninth part of Christianity—this busy, prying, restless mind, which criticises every thing, and believes nothing; pulls down, but never builds up; analyses the principle of life, and by the dissection kills it—which treats the holy Scripture as the ploughboy treated the watch, pulls it to pieces to look at its mechanism, and then wonders that it will not go; which grudges to men even the Apostles' Creed, and will not let them hold that there is one baptism for the remission of sins, but on condition that they communicate with those who deny it; this spirit which, in its most advanced development, casts Christianity itself into the alembic, and makes it come out a volatile essence of Pantheism—in one word, Protestantism *was not*."

The second exposes the origin and working of the supremacy of the temporal sovereign in the Established Church of England.

"As a matter of fact, for more than nine hundred years the See of St. Peter was in this nation the supreme ecclesiastical judge, and matters of faith could be carried before it, as the court of appeal in last resource. And as a matter of fact, for nine hundred and sixty years sixty-nine Archbishops sat in the seat of St. Augustine at Canterbury by the authority of him who sent St. Augustine. But by whose authority did the seventieth sit? who gave to Dr. Parker, not his orders, not his episcopal character, but *mission* to execute the powers which belong to that character in the determinate see of Canterbury, and *authority* to execute the powers of a Primate in the province of Canterbury? To this no answer can be given but one,—Queen Elizabeth gave, or at least attempted to give, that mission and that authority. Let us simply state historical facts.

"Queen Elizabeth, at her accession, found the ancient relation, which for nine hundred and sixty years had subsisted between the See of St. Peter and the Church of England, restored by the act of her sister, after its disturbance by her father and brother. This relation consisted mainly in two points,—that the Pope instituted all Bishops, and was the supreme ecclesiastical judge. Queen Elizabeth caused an act of Parliament to be passed, depriving the Pope of these two powers. And this act was passed in spite of the remonstrances of the Episcopate, the Convocation, and the two Universities. But she did not stop there. Who was to possess these two powers? Somewhere they must be. She coveted them for her

crown; she took and annexed them to that crown. She made herself supreme ecclesiastical judge by causing the appeals, which had ever been made from the Court of the Archbishop to the Pope, to be made to the crown. More need not be said on this head, as all the Courts of the kingdom have just affirmed this power to exist in the Crown; and as her Majesty, in exercise of her authority as supreme ecclesiastical judge, has just reversed the sentence of the Archbishop's Court, and decreed that the clergy of the Church have it wholly at their option to preach and teach that infants are regenerated by God in holy baptism, or that such a doctrine is 'a soul-destroying heresy:' nay, as the perfection of liberty, the same clergyman can now at the font, in the words of the baptismal service, declare his belief in the former doctrine, and in the pulpit proceed to enforce the latter! She took to herself likewise the power of *instituting* Bishops, which is of originating mission and jurisdiction; for every Bishop of the Anglican Church has been from that time instituted by order and commission from the Crown, and by that alone. Now it has been well said that 'sovereigns who covet spiritual authority have never dared to seize it upon the altar with their own hands: they know well that in this there is an absurdity even greater than the sacrilege. Incapable as they are of being *directly* recognised as the source and regulators of religion, they seek to make themselves its masters by the intermediacy of some sacerdotal body enslaved to their wishes: and there, Pontiffs without mission, usurpers of the truth itself, they dole out to their people the measure of it which they think sufficient to check revolt; they make of the blood of Jesus Christ an instrument of moral servitude and of political schemes, until the day when they are taught by terrible catastrophes, that the greatest crime which sovereignty can commit against itself and against society is the meddling touch which profanes religion.'*

"Dr. Parker was instituted by four Bishops without a diocese, who had no power whatever of their own to give mission to the See of Canterbury: they professed to act under Queen Elizabeth's commission. But to shew how the fountain of this mission and spiritual jurisdiction was made to reside in the Crown, we need only refer to the law which enacted, that in case an Archbishop should refuse within a certain time to institute a Bishop at the command of the Crown, *a case which in three hundred years has never occurred*, though Dr. Hoadley and Dr. Hampden have been among the persons instituted, the Crown might issue a commission to any other Bishops of the province to institute, thus overruling the special authority of the Archbishop, as Archbishop.

"Moreover, the letters patent of every Colonial Bishop declare in the most express words that episcopal jurisdiction to govern such and such a diocese, which the letters patent erect, is granted by the Crown. And not only does the Crown *grant* this jurisdiction, but

* Le Père Lacordaire.

it can *reca*l it after it has been once granted. Take the latest exercise of this power:—

“ ‘The Queen has been pleased by letters patent under the great seal of the United Kingdom to *reconstitute* the Bishopric of Quebec, and to direct that the same shall comprise the district of Quebec, Three Rivers, and Gaspé *only*, and be called the Bishopric of Quebec: and her Majesty has been pleased to name and appoint the Right Rev. Father in God, George Jehoshaphat Mountain, Doctor of Divinity, *heretofore Bishop of Montreal, to be Bishop of the said See of Quebec*. Her Majesty has also been pleased to constitute so much of the ancient diocese of Quebec as comprises the district of Montreal, to be a Bishop’s See and Diocese, to be called the Bishopric of Montreal, and to name and appoint the Rev. Francis Fulford, Doctor of Divinity, to be ordained and consecrated Bishop of the said See of Montreal.’

“ All that the Archbishop has to do in such a matter is to give episcopal consecration to a person so designated, on pain of having his goods confiscated, and his person imprisoned; *but he does not give the diocese or the mission*.

“ Her Majesty likewise, in the exercise of Papal authority, has created sundry Metropolitans, as of Calcutta, to whom she has subjected all India; and Sydney, to whom she has subjected not only Australia, but Van Diemen’s Land and New Zealand. Now here let me observe two things. First, that the power to nominate for election, or to elect one to be a Bishop, is quite distinct from the power to institute or confirm, which latter *is the deliverance of the spiritual power of government*. The former privileges may be and are exercised by the civil power; but the latter authority must be derived from a spiritual source. Secondly, the civil power may, if it so choose, give the sanction of civil law to the assignments of dioceses made by the spiritual power, and attach a certain *civil* validity to the spiritual acts of Bishops instituted by spiritual power. But here the case is quite different. The diocese is made and erected, divided and altered, solely by the civil power. The spiritual jurisdiction actually possessed by a Bishop over his flock is taken away, as concerns a part of that flock, and conferred upon another. The Bishop is purely passive under this. And so particular Bishops, already supposed to be under the see of Canterbury, are without permission of that see subjected to an intermediate Metropolitan.

“ Now the whole principle of the Anglican Reformation consists in these two things,—that the civil power is made the origin of mission and spiritual jurisdiction, and the supreme ecclesiastical judge. Those who ask for these things to be altered, ask that the Reformation would be pleased to undo all that it did amiss, and so restore itself to Catholic unity. Would that they may be heard! But there are few signs of it.

“ And the whole of what I have written in the preceding five sections shews that the Papal authority consists in exactly these two points. And thus it was that Queen Elizabeth took and transferred

the Papal Supremacy to herself. And thus it is that authority to administer the sacraments of our Lord Jesus Christ in this or that place or district, the keys of the kingdom of heaven, the power to bind and loose, are pretended to be given by an earthly sovereign. Can there be found in the history of eighteen hundred years a heresy more directly antichristian than this? It strikes at the very heart of the Church of God. From the beginning, the crime of being a creature and a slave of the State has been alleged against the Anglican Establishment. Is this charge true? and if so, in what does it consist? It is not because a communion is *established*; because its Bishops are *nominated* by the Crown and sit in Parliament; because their acts have a civil validity; because its clergy are civil officers; that it can be justly called a creature or a slave of the State. All this may be innocently, may be rightly, may be most happily. But a communion is the creature and the slave of the civil power when the origin of its mission and spiritual jurisdiction, and the supreme judgment upon its doctrine, are vested in the civil power.

“But to return to Queen Elizabeth. Armed with this civil law, which extinguished the supreme jurisdiction of St. Peter's See, and its institution of Bishops, and transferred both these powers to the Crown, imposing an oath for their maintenance, she ordered this oath to be administered to the existing Bishops. The Primacy was vacant, and sixteen members of the Episcopate alone survived. Of these, *fifteen* refused to sever that link between their sees and the See of Rome which had subsisted for nine hundred and sixty years, from the very foundation of the Church, refused beside to acknowledge the transference of the two above-named spiritual powers to the crown. In virtue of that law they were deposed. One Bishop, Kitchen of Llandaff, had the heart to accept these conditions, and continued on in his see, surrendering to courtiers the greater part of its endowments. But even he took no part in the confirmation or consecration of the new Primate.

“And so the ancient Episcopate, which derived its succession from St. Augustine and its mission from St. Peter, became extinct in banishment, in captivity, and in *duresse*. The Episcopate which for well-nigh a thousand years had formed and civilised and blessed England in a thousand ways, and by which it was a member of the great Christian body, was swept away; and a new Episcopate, deriving its mission from Queen Elizabeth, and perpetually dependent for its jurisdiction on the Crown of England, and owning in that Crown its supreme ecclesiastical judge, arose. This is its origin, this the principle on which it is built,—the subjection of the spiritual power to the civil in spiritual things, in faith and in discipline. *Humanam conati sunt facere Ecclesiam*. They attempted, and they have succeeded. For myself, now that after long years of pain and distress, of thought, of inquiry, and of prayer, since by the mercy of God the light has broken upon me, let me say as much as this—for not to say it would be to conceal the strongest conviction, nei-

ther formed in a hurry, nor reached without great suffering,—let those who can put their trust in such a Church and such an Episcopate, those who can feel their souls safe in such a system, work in it, think for it, write for it, pray for it, and *trust their souls to it*. But the duty which I owe to Almighty God, and the regard which I have for my salvation, compel me to declare my belief, by word and by act, that it is an *imposture*, all the more dangerous to the souls of men, to the affectionate, to the obedient, to those who believe that there is ‘one Body and one Spirit,’ because it pretends to be a member of the Catholic body, with which it has broken the essential relation, and to possess spiritual powers, which it has indeed forfeited.”

But we must return for a few moments to our practical inquiring Englishman. That he will remain unconvinced by Mr. Allies is scarcely possible. So far as the history of Christianity can tell what Christianity is, the cause is decided. Yet will his English mind for awhile rebel. Long standing and dearly cherished prejudices will not yield before one argument, irresistible though it be to the unbiassed reason. Though he distinctly sees that the Pope alone remains as a possible guide to the knowledge of Christianity which he is seeking, and that he must either submit to him or altogether renounce his belief in a doctrinal revelation, he is still haunted with the terrors of his childhood and youth. The dark phantom which for so many years has brooded over his imagination *cannot* be, he concludes, nothing less than an angel of light. It is impossible. If the Pope were the representative of Almighty God upon earth, *could* he be what he has ever been accounted, or any thing nearly so fearful? Is it credible that the man who is placed on the throne of Jesus Christ to teach his message of mercy to mankind should have tortured the bodies and shed the blood of heretics, should be the bitterest opponent of freedom, the instigator of rebellion, the enemy of Scripture-reading, the persecutor of science, a reveller in wealth and grandeur, and sometimes a man notorious for his crimes? His whole nature shudders at the thought. Protestantism may be a deceit; Bible-reading may lead to every folly; Mr. Allies may prove to a demonstration that the early Church revered the Popes as supreme; what is all this after the fires of Smithfield, the dungeons of the Inquisition, the excommunication of sovereigns, after Galileo, and after Alexander Borgia? The world and its civilisation evidently cannot go on if the Papal pretensions are permitted. Better believe nothing than suffer such a tyrant to place his feet upon the neck of the whole human race.

Such for a time will be, perhaps, our inquirer's meditations. The doctrine of the Papal Supremacy is presenting itself to his mind in all its bearings. Still preserving his practical character, he desires to be satisfied as to the working of the Roman system. He cannot clasp a conclusion to his heart, convinced as he may be that *no other* conclusion is logically possible. This may be the French method, or the German method, or the enthusiast's method. *He* ever looks to results; and before he can acquiesce in the doctrine that the Papal Supremacy *is from God*, he must know more of its effects. If, in fact, it turns out not to be the monstrous despotism he has been habituated to believe it, then—he is not yet prepared to say what will be his ultimate conclusion, but—it is no longer impossible that he may become a Catholic.

In this state of feeling we should refer him to Count De Maistre's great work, *Du Pape*. Mr. Dawson's translation has just made it accessible to every English reader; and it is precisely adapted to the completion of the conversion already begun. Its merits are already known throughout Catholic Christendom; and we are scarcely guilty of exaggeration in saying that few modern books have exercised so powerful an influence on influential minds. Mr. Dawson has our sincere thanks for his version; and we should rejoice to learn that it has fallen into the hands of every doubting Englishman, such as we have supposed our inquiring friend to be. Its publication is especially opportune at the present moment, when events have displayed the Royal Supremacy in a more odious light than ever to every person who sincerely believes that the kingdom of Jesus Christ is not of this world; and that when He enjoined a faith in his doctrines as the condition of salvation, He did not mock the people whom He had redeemed by leaving them without a trustworthy exponent of what those doctrines are.

And thus we take leave of our inquiring fellow-countryman. What would be the ultimate issue of his investigations, we need not speculate. Our purpose has been solely to shew the probable workings of minds of the peculiar character supposed to belong to our island nature, when led to contemplate the doctrine of the Papal Supremacy as a solution of religious difficulties. We are not tracing the process of conversion, whose origin and ultimate accomplishment must be sought elsewhere. The grace of God, which alone converts the soul, overpowers *every* obstacle, whether of country, rank, age, or natural disposition. Before its burning heat the ice of indifference and the rock of prejudice are alike

compelled to melt. We have merely followed the movements of Nature, as she accompanies, or rather yields to the operations of a power more mighty than herself. And if we have at all succeeded in carrying our readers along with us, we shall have gone far to convince them that the old notion that Englishmen are too shrewd and business-like to submit to the claims of Rome is one of the most baseless of the popular fallacies which were accounted to be eternal truths by past generations.

MOUNT ST. LAWRENCE.

Mount St. Lawrence. By the Author of "*Mary, the Star of the Sea.*" In 2 vols. Longmans.

Mount St. Lawrence belongs to a class of books hitherto grievously scarce amongst us. In a certain sense, it is a religious novel, or rather a novel written on religious principles. It is not a "religious novel" of the kind in which controversy constitutes the plot, and all the personages are literally fictitious, that is, such as neither nature nor grace ever produced in real life. Stories in which the literary frame-work is prominently subservient to the inculcation of theological doctrine are rarely tolerable, either as stories or as theology. The heroes and heroines, and other devout characters, have it all their own way, with such gratifying facility, that the practical result of perusal varies between a minimum of instruction, a minimum of edification, and a minimum of pleasure; and the exhausted reader turns to a *real* novel—that is, in all probability, an irreligious one—for refreshment and something like nature.

Yet Christian novels are unquestionably most agreeable and useful companions to our leisure. Fiction has become so intimately a part of our modern civilisation, that the Catholic can never overlook its importance. Every body, or nearly every body, reads novels. The profoundest thinker delights in the rest which their lively scenes supply to his wearied brain. The gravest theologian at times skims over their pages, and we doubt not draws an occasional hint for the most weighty of purposes. There is not one person in a hundred, who is not absolutely forbidden such studies by his rule of life, who does not turn now and then to something in the shape of a story for half an hour's easy repose. Of ordinary

persons the number of novel-readers is prodigious, and considering what is the nature of the immense majority of novels, the injury they thus suffer is incalculable. It is not that English fiction is generally what is called immoral. It is for the most part decent and correct, and even occasionally religious in its own way. Nevertheless, it is so intensely worldly in its tone, in its recognised aims, and in its catastrophes, that we cannot doubt that it is one of the devil's most subtle instruments for enslaving unwary and ill-formed minds.

As to getting rid of novel-reading altogether by absolutely forbidding it, it is simply impossible. We might as reasonably expect the average class of Catholics to live the life of Trappist monks, as to refrain wholly from novels. Nor, for our own part, can we overlook the real and serious *benefits* which fiction has it in its power to confer. If private domestic conversation can be made edifying, without becoming didactic and sermonising, why should not a written story or dialogue join in the good work? The personages of a novel are our companions for the hour. We feel with them, we feel for them. Their sentiments affect us, almost as the words of living men and women. We are secretly tempted to imitate them or avoid them, according to the fate they meet with. Theorise as we may, with the weak and susceptible their practical power is immense; with the strong and cold it is very far from imaginary.

What we want, therefore, is not controversial novels, or books of instruction with a plot and regular catastrophe. We want books in which Catholics are like real Catholics, and Protestants like real Protestants; in which virtue has such a reward as is within the limits of probability; and beauty, rank, and ten thousand a year are not perpetually held up before our eyes as the *summum bonum* of human felicity. We want stories in which the scenes wear just that mingled colouring which actual life displays; where what *appears* is for the most part secular, and the hidden springs of Catholic life and devotion burst forth when occasion calls for them, and only then. Stories like these—presupposing always that their literary merits are not below par—are undoubtedly not merely agreeable, but positively useful. They not only conciliate and win the unbelieving, but they instruct and edify the devout. We are not harassed with that incessant worldliness which interferes with our enjoyment of almost all Protestant fictions, and which prevents us from even thoroughly enjoying the very best of them.

Such a story is *Mount St. Lawrence*. The theological portion, properly so called, occupies but a small portion of its

pages. Its characters are, for the most part, as pretty specimens of undisguised worldliness as any chance country or London house would furnish. All the people are not converted in the end, nor are all the Protestants great sinners and all the Catholics saints. There is plenty of gossip, plenty of love-making, and plenty of petty domestic intrigue. There is even a fancy ball, and a hunting party, and dinner and breakfast conversations *ad libitum*. All the "machinery" of the real novel are here. But there is just this difference between *Mount St. Lawrence* and the ordinary tale, that not for one moment does it place earth above heaven, or trespass beyond the limits of a perfect delicacy and refinement. How it winds up, and how poetical justice is executed, we shall leave our readers to ascertain for themselves; as we shall be much disappointed if *Mount St. Lawrence* does not obtain even a larger popularity than the charming little volume which was its author's first contribution to Catholic literature.

As a work of art, we are disposed to assign to *Mount St. Lawrence* a very high position. The story itself is simple and ordinary enough, as is, in fact, the case in all good fictions which paint the private life of the present day. The moment the novel or tale verges upon the romance, it changes its character for the worse. The very every-day character of the plot (so to call it) is only in harmony with the every-day and genuine character of the actors; and it is because *nothing* crosses us in *Mount St. Lawrence* which we have not seen a hundred times in real life, or which we know to be perpetually happening, that the entire result is so complete and satisfying. The whole family of the St. Lawrences are the very type of what a household would naturally be under their circumstances; and, on the whole, there is scarcely a page which is not the result of many a year of silent watching of the greatnesses and littlenesses, the infirmities and the graces, of cultivated and wealthy English life; while the wit, liveliness, and sweet feeling with which the whole story is told, make it one of the most agreeable books we know of.

It is a difficult matter to quote from a story, and at the same time do justice to the story itself. Fragments torn from the context are dull, and half unintelligible, and we suspect that few persons trouble themselves to read them. Perhaps we shall best consult our readers' pleasure by extracting the very first scene in the book, and so help them over what is always the hardest part of a novel, the commencement. It is a tolerably fair specimen of the mingled delicacy and force of colouring which are one of the many charms of the whole book.

“It was late in the afternoon, at that season of the year when the heat of the sun’s rays begins to be tempered, while as yet the chill of approaching autumn has not invaded the early evening hours. An open window on the ground-floor of an old-fashioned mansion, whose exterior spoke of some centuries back, while its comfortable though hardly luxurious interior as plainly bespoke the present century of bodily ease and refinement, still invited the free ingress of air from the pretty garden into which it opened. The beauty of this garden, which was small, consisted mainly in its sweet look of privacy, a high screen of laurel and other evergreens completely shutting it in, and giving it that peculiar air of retirement, which some reckon dull, but which is very soothing to the minds of others, to whose imagination a garden enclosed brings, as it were, the charm of a recollected Eden.

“Be this as it may, this little confined space of mossy green and flowery beds (for no gravel-walk had been permitted, while offering its accommodation, grievously to interfere with the imagination) formed the delight of its youthful mistress, and furnished her an inexhaustible field for contemplation; not idle contemplation or dreamy reverie, for Rose was neither idle nor sentimental; but this garden was to her a kind of living book, a mirror reflecting back to her in type her deepest thoughts and aspirations, and suggesting to her endless subjects of meditation. Her eyes, however, rested not on it at this moment, but on the pages of a large and closely printed folio, which lay open on the carved desk before her. Rose’s beauty was of a very peculiar kind, and one not common in this country; but this peculiarity was heightened, perhaps, by that of her dress, which, being scarcely suitable to a girl of eighteen, imparted something singular to her appearance. There was a combination of costliness and simplicity in it which might be the result of a refinement of vanity, or the mere exhibition of a peculiar taste. The reader must be content to wait, in order to form a guess at the reason; or rather, if he will give a glance at Rose’s guileless countenance, he will decide at once against the former supposition. And truly a guileless countenance was hers, with something beyond her years of pensiveness when grave, and something less than her years of gaiety when she smiled. Rose had not lost the smile of childhood yet; perhaps she may never lose it. But the pensive mood had full possession at the moment we are describing, and it formed the general character of her countenance. She had a face rather full than oval, with that remarkably colourless fairness which will sometimes accompany black hair—a fairness never stained by the slightest suffusion, save when the colour was called there by a blush, or by the fresh air of heaven. Her large dark contemplative eyes riveted your attention from a mysterious depth in them, rather than from a highly intellectual character. They had a strange fascination, those thoughtful eyes with their sable fringe; while her coal-black hair, parted on the smooth forehead, and wound in long braids round her head, harmonised well with their expression. Her mouth, which

was small and delicately formed, had the full contour and innocent sweetness of childhood. Add to all this, that she had a rather small but very graceful figure, with which her black velvet gown and its simple collar of costly lace, scarcely more white than the throat it encircled, suited well from their very simplicity; and it will be admitted that Rose O'Donnell had no small claim to admiration. She wore no ornament, unless an ebony chain might be considered such; and whatever might be attached to it was evidently cherished from love, not worn for show, for it was concealed in her bosom.

"Rose was reading, as has just been observed, or rather she was meditating on a passage she had just read, while her eyes still rested upon it. And what was the subject of this book? Was it some stirring romance of the olden time, or some highly-wrought modern tale of love? It was indeed a story, in comparison with which the wondrous deeds of ancient chivalry might well seem commonplace and trifling—it was indeed a tale of perfect and devoted love. For what deeds of heroism which human motives ever inspired, what purest and tenderest love which ever filled a human heart towards the earthly treasure of its affections, can truly deserve the name of heroism or love? They are but the pale shadows of spiritual acts and affections. And so thought Rose as she meditated on the life of the saintly Virgin of Peru, the flower of the Indies, the blessed Rose of Lima. Suddenly a thought arrested her in the full glow of her fervent imagination, and she looked round on the room in which she was seated. 'Is this real? is this genuine?' she said to herself. 'Am I not deceiving myself? Do I really admire and love this? Do I really long after any resemblance to this, however remote? Do I desire, I say not the crown of thorns, but one thorn even out of the crown? I sit, I walk, I sleep in the midst of luxuries; I even pray in the midst of them. I know not if even the flowers in my little oratory, and the wreaths I weave for my sweet Mother, and the jewels with which I deck her, are the true expressions of love; perhaps I love in my imagination only, and not in my heart. Alas! if these should after all be only sentiments and feelings, and my will be untouched!' Rose recoiled from the painful thought; and yet she said, 'Oh, no, no! I cannot believe it!' And taking the silver crucifix from her bosom, never forgotten though concealed, her Friend and Resource in all sorrows and difficulties, she gazed at it with deep tenderness. 'Oh, no!' she murmured to herself, 'I love—I do love; I desire to love, at least. But I need a guide, and I have none. But who have ever been allowed to suffer for that which they lacked not through their own fault? If there be really a true love of God in my heart, He will not suffer it to die; and, oh, may I die rather than extinguish it!' Then devoutly kissing her crucifix, she returned to her accustomed tranquillity.

"Her eyes were again on the page, when the door gently opened, and Colonel O'Donnell entered the apartment. He was a tall man of about fifty, with the military air of one who has actually seen service. A high and thoughtful forehead, a quiet self-possession,

and the ease and tact of a man of the world, distinguished Colonel O'Donnell; while a certain almost melancholy expression in his whole manner, as if some great misfortune or bitter loss, recovered but not forgotten, had cast its shadow over his life, gave an interest to his appearance. And so it was. Colonel O'Donnell's affections were warm and deep; and the early loss of a beloved wife, not long after the birth of their only child, which at first nearly drove him to despair, had left a furrow on his brow which had never been effaced. And now his widowed heart had turned for consolation to his remaining earthly blessing, his darling, his beautiful Rose. Oh, the misery of deep and passionate affections treasured up in vessels of clay! She too, his idolised, his beautiful Rose, may fail him! And then whither will he turn?

"Colonel O'Donnell's manner was preoccupied when he entered the room; but his face beamed, as it was ever wont to do, with affection at the sight of his daughter. He sat down by her and encircled her with his arm, while she repaid his caress with that loving, child-like smile of hers. If Colonel O'Donnell had any matter of importance in his mind, his first words had no reference to it, but seemed suggested by the circumstances of the moment. 'What are you reading, my child?' he said, glancing at the open volume. 'The life of my blessed patroness,' answered Rose; 'you know it is my birthday to-day into this world, and it was hers to glory.' 'Yes,' answered her father with a sigh, 'it was your dear mother's last wish that you should be called after the saint on whose day you were born. This book was hers, and you value it, I am sure; but, my Rose,' he continued, gently closing the book, 'you have spent, I fear, but a sad birthday. What would you say if I had a surprise for you this evening?' 'I have not been sad, dear father,' said Rose; 'but I don't think I like surprises: they frighten me; and I prefer knowing things beforehand.' 'Well,' replied her father, 'there is nothing, at any rate, to frighten you to-day. Horace returns this evening. You are glad, are you not?' 'Oh, that I am!' said Rose, joining her hands with almost childish glee. 'You love Horace, do you not?' said her father, not looking at her, but half-opening and shutting one corner of the large volume. 'To be sure I do,' said Rose; 'for I have no brother, and you know Horace was like an elder brother to me.' Colonel O'Donnell's countenance almost imperceptibly fell. 'Do you wish he was your brother?' was his answer. 'Oh, very much!' replied Rose readily. 'Why?' said her father, with some anxiety. 'Oh, I don't know,' said his daughter; 'but I think it is because he would belong to us more, and would not go away.'

"Colonel O'Donnell's face relaxed into a smile of satisfaction as he kissed his daughter's fair forehead. A short silence ensued, which was broken by Rose. 'Does Horace stay long?' 'Not long; that is to say, not long at present,' answered her father, with some mystery. 'But when he returns he *may* stay long—very long. It depends upon'—and Colonel O'Donnell hesitated.

Rose looked in his face with curiosity and anxiety; he made an effort, and concluded his sentence with more firmness—‘upon you, Rose.’ ‘Upon me! how is that possible?’ was her reply. ‘My child,’ resumed her father, ‘I have ever found you a dutiful and affectionate daughter, seeking your happiness in seconding my wishes, and placing a full trust in your father that his wishes could have no other end than that happiness. I feel certain, then, that when you know that I have cherished, ever since your childhood, a favourite project with respect to your future life,—I feel certain, I say, that I shall find you disposed to enter readily into it. I trust also that you cannot but naturally be favourably inclined towards the companion of your childhood, and the son of my earliest and best friend. Left as Horace has been to my care, and standing to me in the place of a son, I have looked forward with fond hope towards a future union between you, which shall separate neither from me, and ensure the happiness of both my children.’

“While Colonel O'Donnell spoke, the colour went and came in Rose's face, but left it at last paler than usual. She attempted to stammer some answer, but the words died on her lips. ‘Enough, enough, my child,’ said her father; ‘I know all you would say. Your silence is sufficient answer. I knew that my wishes would be your guide. I need not assure you that it is also the dearest wish of Horace's heart.’ ‘Oh, hear me a minute!’ said Rose, joining her hands with a look of anxiety and dismay. ‘You know, dearest father, your wishes are always my law; and if I marry, there is none I could prefer to the companion of my childhood and the object of your choice; but in this matter, is there not another's will to consult—can we decide at once that I *am* to marry?’ ‘What means all this?’ interrupted Colonel O'Donnell, impatiently; ‘who has been putting these foolish prejudices against marriage into your head? I thought better of my Rose than to expect a piece of affectation from her.’ ‘It is not affectation or prejudice,’ replied Rose earnestly; ‘neither has any one spoken to me about it; it is every good book I read, every saint's life, that tells me we ought to pray to God to know the state of life He intends us for. I have never—it is my own fault I know—but I have never made it yet the subject of prayer, and can I come to a decision before I have done so?’ ‘I knew it,’ said her father, pushing the desk and book away; ‘it is the poring incessantly over these books night and day which puts these fancies into your mind.’

“Rose might have answered, that if it was so, this was but one of the good effects the lives of God's saints were intended to produce; but like most young persons speaking to those they respect, she felt as if she had to apologise for and excuse herself, rather than to assume any higher ground. ‘Not these books only, father,’ she answered, ‘but every book speaks the same language; the book of devotion you yourself gave me the other day contained prayers for choosing one's state in life.’ Colonel O'Donnell gave no heed, but continued in a satirical tone: ‘And so you expect to be an-

other St. Rose of Lima or St. Theresa? Really, if the idea were not perfectly ludicrous, as coming from my little indolent comfort-loving Rose, I might answer it seriously. What! one who can scarce come down to breakfast in time of a frosty morning; who has her cup of tea in her room if she has a little cold; who sits with her feet in the fender for four or five months of the year; who goes out to see the poor—ay, I know you are fond of doing that, and would spend every sixpence upon them, if I did not insist on a certain sum being laid out on your dress; but who goes out in her little pony-chaise to the village in her well-wadded fur cloak in winter, and carefully shaded in summer by her veil and parasol,—does *she* fancy she has a vocation for a hard convent-life? This was really no sufficient answer to Rose's observation; but shame and the natural diffidence and sensitiveness of her disposition made her feel as if she were in the wrong, and as if she had been guilty of some presumptuous and misplaced remark; she looked down abashed, and the tears came into her eyes. 'And how long,' continued her father, dropping his ironical tone, 'have you had this notion in your mind?' 'Not long,' faltered Rose; 'sometimes lately it has occurred to me.' 'Have you ever spoken to Father Gerard about it?' 'No, never.' 'But how comes it,' he resumed, 'that you have not spoken to your Confessor of that which you consider of such importance?' 'It has never occurred to me till lately,' replied Rose gently; 'and you know we so seldom go to Confession; besides, I have had no very definite ideas upon the subject. What you have just said to me brought it more distinctly before my mind than I ever remember it before.' 'I don't know what you mean by seldom going to Confession,' said her father gravely. 'We go at the eight Indulgences; and considering the distance of Portmore, I think more can hardly be expected.' 'I know that,' said Rose; 'I was not finding fault; I was only accounting for what I had said.'

"Rose's affections were deep, and her sensitiveness extreme; she was, besides, naturally of a yielding disposition; moreover, what she had said was true, her ideas were as yet very indefinite upon this subject; or rather, the first faint whisper perhaps of divine grace to her soul, calling her perchance to a higher life than that of the exercise of the domestic affections and household duties, had as yet much to contend against. It seemed silent now, or at least was unheard amidst the rushing tide of her natural feelings. Rose almost regretted what she had said, and remained silent. After a moment's pause, Colonel O'Donnell took her hand, and began to speak in his usual kind tone. 'My dear Rose, do not suppose I am ignorant that there is such a thing as a vocation. No good Catholic can be so; but I am also not ignorant that God does not leave persons in doubt where such exists; still less does He leave it to be decided by the enthusiastic and inexperienced judgment of an imaginative child. Can there be a worse guide than imagination in these matters? Do you suppose you are able or fit to do

all that you admire? When your heart beats with admiration at the story of some heroic deed of arms, do you believe, because your blood flows quicker and your cheek glows, that you have therefore yourself the courage to mount the breach, or rush into the field? No, my dear Rose, a vocation shews itself in a fitness for that life which it requires, at least a commencement of such fitness; and where there is a total absence of such disposition, to take the imagination for a guide would be ruinous. Believe me, Rose, I have watched you since infancy, and know you better than you do yourself. However, it is far, very far from my wish to control you; I shall interfere with no authority; only I do not choose that the feelings and happiness of my friend's son should be trifled with; and if I am to understand what you have said as the deliberate expression of your disinclination to marry, Horace shall not remain, no, not a day.' 'But, father, leave me some time to think,' said Rose; 'I wish to do what is right, I wish to please you; but I am bewildered, I am confused.' 'This is what I desire to do,' replied her father; 'and I shall much prefer it to any further painful conversation on the matter. If your decision is against my desire, and that you feel that you have an insuperable repugnance to marriage, I never wish to resume the subject again. Now hear me, Rose: Horace comes this evening, but he will not know that I have as yet spoken to you. When you retire, I shall apprise him of your determination; and if adverse, he shall leave Crewe Hall for good, before you have risen to-morrow morning. Now I shall know whether you have so decided by this token.' Here Colonel O'Donnell drew from his bosom a small jewel-case. 'Hitherto, Rose, you have shewn an unwillingness to wearing any ornaments, and I have never pressed you to do so; I now request you, however, to wear this evening this diamond ornament. Your mother wore it the day she pledged her faith to me at the altar. I may yet see it again with pleasure on her child, her living image, and I shall know what it means. I shall know that it means that you desire to please me, should your own inclinations not oppose themselves to my wishes; for, of course, I do not pretend to extort any irrevocable promise from you. But if I see it not,' and Colonel O'Donnell's voice faltered, 'then I shall know that your mind is made up, and that I need look to no more dreams of earthly happiness. God grant that your choice may be for your own!'

"Colonel O'Donnell rose, and left the room. Rose fixed her eyes on the diamond butterfly, and a thought flashed through her mind of the mysterious butterfly, pledge of how different a love, which settled on St. Rose's heart; but she thought next of her father's sad and grave face, and his ruined hopes of peaceful and happy days, and she burst into tears.

"Evening came; and Colonel O'Donnell, with his daughter and Horace Ferrers, was seated in the old oak drawing-room. Rose looked something paler than usual; she wore the same black velvet gown, but the diamond butterfly sparkled upon her bosom."

SHORT NOTICES.

MR. FREEMAN'S *Remarks on the Architecture of Llandaff Cathedral* (Pickering) is a very intelligent essay on one of the most curious, though not one of the most beautiful, of the old English religious structures. The author is one of a school of critics which we trust to see more common. He does not think every abortion a fair creation provided an "example" can be found for it, or, in a passion for details, overlook the *first* element of excellence—proportion. His "History of Architecture" is already well known, and we shall expect another valuable antiquarian work from his joint labours with Mr. Jones on the highly interesting remains at St. David's. We cannot, of course, sympathise with all Mr. Freeman's views, as he is a Protestant, though we are bound to say his pages are less disfigured by sectarianism than the ordinary class of the Anglican books on architecture and art in general. The illustrations, which include a clever "restoration" of the fabric, are all that can be desired.

In the *Dublin Review* for October is an extremely interesting article on German Prophecies respecting the state of the Church. The allusion to the conversion of England in many well-accredited prophecies is not their least remarkable feature. The estimate of Carlyle's abilities in another paper we think much exaggerated.

Cardinal Wiseman's last two *Sermons delivered at St. George's* (Richardson) previous to his departure for Rome will be read with especial interest from the occasion which called them forth. We can only hope that this interest will partly cease by its being proved that they were *not* farewell sermons.

Seven Questions bearing upon the present Ecclesiastical Crisis, by Agathon (Dolman), put cleverly the elementary absurdities of the Protestant rule of faith, and of Protestant notions on the Church, on confession, and other Catholic doctrines and practices. "Agathon" may rest tolerably secure of his five hundred pounds, which he offers for rational replies to his queries.

A Voice from the North, by an English Priest (Masters), is the triumph of coolness. Were it not shocking that persons with such opinions should peril their souls by remaining in the Church which they denounce so bitterly, the cutting and slashing with which this "English Priest" favours his own communion would be entertaining enough.

Two little manuals, *The Office of the Immaculate Conception*, in Latin and English, and the *Psalterium Davidis* (Burns and Lambert), will be useful to many. The latter contains, besides the Psalter complete, the Little Office of the Blessed Virgin, and Morning and Evening Prayers, Prayers for a Journey, and the Litanies of the

Holy Name of Jesus and of the Blessed Virgin, all in Latin. It is a very elegant little pocket manual.

The Synod of Thurles, the various synods recently held and still to be held in France and other parts of the continent, and the probability that similar episcopal assemblies may be called together in England, give a peculiar interest to Cardinal de la Luzerne's great work on the *Rights and Duties of Bishops and Priests in the Church*, not long ago published for the first time at Paris (Migne). It is a work of rare learning and completeness, discussing dogmatically and historically a subject which is at all times of great interest, but which was painfully important when the author wrote. When the storms of the early days of the first revolution broke upon the Church and nation of France, the Gallican and Jansenistic principles, which had been too much favoured by some of her prelates, rebounded upon their own heads; and they found it loudly maintained by many and not insignificant writers, that the priesthood sits, by divine right, with the episcopate, in synods and councils, both to deliberate and to judge. This idea was based on certain scriptural texts, and on the fact, that on *some* occasions both priests and laymen had taken a part in such ecclesiastical assemblies. That nothing could be more natural than that in certain circumstances the inferior clergy, and learned and able laymen also, should be *invited* to be present, and even give their opinions, on purely ecclesiastical matters, is not to be questioned. To deny to the episcopate the right of taking advice and gathering information from *any* quarter would be simply absurd. Even of the College of Cardinals laymen are sometimes members.* The assertions of the "constitutional" party in the Gallican Church went, however, far beyond this; their object was clearly a levelling one, and its destructive tendencies demanded a thorough exposure. This they meet with in the admirable work of Cardinal de la Luzerne, then Bishop of Langres. No similar agitations, happily, now disturb the Church, but the mode in which he has treated the subject renders his work of permanent value, and it cannot be too strongly recommended to those who would wish to know how the Church has ever acted in her juridical capacity. The amount of historical knowledge he has brought to bear upon the proceedings of the Councils of the Church, from the earliest to the most recent times, is wonderful.

Of the *Catéchismes philosophiques, polémiques, historiques, dogmatiques, moraux, liturgiques, disciplinaires, canoniques, pratiques, ascétiques, et mystiques*, edited by the Abbé Migne, two large volumes are issued. Each volume, or rather each catechism, is complete in itself; but the whole will form a connected series. They may be ranged under three heads; first, philosophical catechisms, leading the mind to faith, confirming it, and making it fruitful; secondly, doctrinal catechisms, expounding the whole science of revealed dog-

* Monsignor Roberti, one of the newly created Cardinals, is a layman.

ma; and thirdly, spiritual catechisms, setting forth the details of the Christian life, from its first elements to its perfection in the saint. The two volumes before us comprise Feller's "Philosophical Catechism," Aimé's "Catechism on the Foundations of the Faith," Scheffmacher's "Catechism of Controversy," Rohrbacher's "Catechism of Common Sense," Pey's "The Philosopher become Catechist," Le François "Honest Man's Catechism," Alletz's "Catechism of Mature Age," Almeyda's "Harmony of Reason and Religion," Fleury's "Historical Catechism," Powey's "Theological Catechism," Bellarmine's "Explanation of the Apostles' Creed and of Christian Doctrine," Mensi's "Historical, Dogmatic, and Moral Catechism on the principal Festivals," Collot and Bossuet's "Supplement to Mensi," Challoner and Gother's Catechism (translated from the English), Swim's "Spiritual Catechism," and Olier's "Catechism of the Interior Life."

The first of this series, Feller's "Philosophical Catechism," discusses chiefly the difficulties of revelation and religion. Its author was one of the most distinguished of the Jesuit body at the time of the suppression of the society, and the present work is worthy of his reputation. Aimé's catechism is a short but clearly arranged outline of the elements of faith and morals. Scheffmacher's is a manual of the outlines of Catholic controversy. The "Catechism of Common Sense" is one of the most useful in the series. Its author is the learned author of the "History of the Church." His catechism is eminently adapted to minds of the English common sense cast. The two next in order are brilliant and entertaining dialogues between unbelievers and believers. The titles of the rest explain themselves. The whole are eminently adapted to the study of the laity, while they furnish extremely convenient sketches of teaching and controversy to the clergy. The catechetical form into which they are thrown is far from making them stiff and dry; on the contrary, it frequently serves to confer an additional point and freshness. The price, even when the cost of carriage and duty is added, is very low.

A Letter to the Rev. Dr. Pusey on his practice of receiving Persons in Auricular Confession, by William Maskell, M.A. (Pickering), is an extremely able little pamphlet, which should be placed, if possible, in the hands of every penitent of Dr. Pusey, and, indeed, of persons generally belonging to the Anglican communion, who are in the habit of going to confession *to any but their own "parish priest."* We have no space to enter upon the important question which it discusses, but that it *should* be entered upon and most thoroughly sifted by those whom it concerns, there can be no doubt. A glance at the concluding paragraph is enough to shew this.

"If, then—let me repeat it, *if*—that one clause of the exhortation of your Church on which you so entirely rest, be not indeed a recognition and allowance of your practice, it is undeniably certain that the absolutions which you are accustomed to give secretly and

without authority from your superiors, to persons who come to you without the knowledge and against the consent of their parish-priest, are by those same rules, which you yourself in all other respects most carefully observe, null and invalid. They who have received at your hands 'the benefit of absolution' are, so far as regards any sacramental grace or blessing, still in the bond and under the penalty of their sins."

Such plain speaking *ought* to excite the attention of all High Churchmen who are really in earnest in what they are doing.

A more generally interesting portion of this pamphlet, and one scarcely less important to the Anglicans themselves, will be found at pp. 17-21, where Mr. Maskell unmasks, with a gentle yet unrelenting hand, some of Dr. Pusey's extreme and extraordinary disingenuousness in his recent Letter to the Rev. W. U. Richards. For the particular instances, which are really such as in ordinary matters of this world, and in the writings of most men, could only adequately be designated by a short monosyllable, we must refer our readers to Mr. Maskell's pamphlet itself, in which they will find them kindly but severely exposed.

We must content ourselves with quoting a single passage from Mr. Maskell's interesting remarks upon this branch of his subject. He is commenting on the simple confidence which Dr. Pusey expresses regarding the non-interference of the Anglican Bishops with his practice of hearing confessions any where and every where; and he very properly asks, whether they know what that practice really is. What would they say, he asks, "of persons secretly received (to confession) against the known will of their parents—of confessions heard in the houses of common friends, or of clandestine correspondence to arrange meetings, under initials, or in envelopes addressed to other persons? Think not that I write all this to give you unnecessary pain; think not that I write it without a feeling of deep pain and sorrow in my own heart. But there is something which tells me that, on behalf of thousands, this matter should now be brought before the world, plainly, honestly, and fully. I know how heavily the enforced mystery and secret correspondence regarding confessions, in your communion, has weighed down the minds of many to whom you and others have 'ministered;' I know how bitterly it has eaten, even as a canker, into their very souls; I know how utterly the specious arguments which you have urged have failed to remove their burning sense of shame and of deceitfulness. And for their sakes, forgetting both myself and you, I speak so plainly as I have."

We will only add, that we ourselves know an instance in which an Anglican clergyman and a *penitent of Dr. Pusey*, now a Catholic, traces almost his earliest doubts as to the tenableness of his position to the detection of the disingenuous teaching of his director; and we have heard of other such cases. We know also a mixed family of Catholics and Protestants, in which the conversion to Catholicism of the one portion was hailed as a positive blessing by the

other, because it put an end to so much shuffling, subterfuge, and concealment; and indeed we are convinced that the *morality* (!) of Tractarianism has been, under God's blessing, a most fruitful source of conversions to the Catholic Church, whether it be through the shifting arguments of its teachers, or the miserable devices to which their disciples were driven, in order that they might have an opportunity of practising what they believed to be almost, if not quite, essential to their salvation. Most truly does Mr. Maskell speak of the custom of auricular confession as practised in the Anglican Establishment, as "a custom carefully hidden, concealed, and sometimes almost denied;" and gladly we hail this contribution towards "bringing it before the world plainly, honestly, and fully."

The History of England for Catholic Children (Burns and Lambert) is a little work whose appearance we welcome with great pleasure, not only on account of its own merits, but because we hope it is the beginning of a series of educational books for Catholic children. The want of such books is grievously felt by all who are engaged in teaching; for, as it is, we must either content ourselves with meagre and ill-written compilations, or use Protestant books, thereby laying on ourselves the burden of incessant watchfulness to guard our children's minds against false impressions.

The little work before us is one of considerable ability; the narrative is full of freshness and life, and evidently drawn from original sources; and we cannot but admire the taste and skill with which the author has selected such points as are likely to strike the imaginations of children. The general fairness too of the views inculcated is much to be admired: in the account, for instance, of the reign of Queen Elizabeth,—while the wickedness of the dominant party and of the Queen herself is exposed, and held up to detestation, as it ought to be; at the same time, all the brighter points, such as the brilliancy of the court, the talents of the Queen, and her spirited conduct on some occasions, are faithfully brought forward.

We have noticed in a rapid perusal several little errors in matters of fact, which should be corrected in the next edition: among others, the statement that Burke was educated at a Catholic college, and that Grattan and Curran were Catholics. We would also recommend the author to reconsider the last two chapters, and to omit the mention of living individuals, which, whatever be the truth of what is said, is rarely in good taste. How can Charles the Second, also, be called, "with all his faults, a straight-forward good-hearted man?" Considering, again, what was the character of James the Second before his downfall, it can but lead to error to head the chapter which tells his history, "*Holy King James*," or to omit all mention of his immoralities. Still the work is eminently useful, and just what a Catholic child's history should be.

M. Perret, an accomplished French artist, has been engaged for five years in the Catacombs of Rome, tracing the frescoes and mea-

suring the monuments with the greatest care. A great number of the frescoes and monuments are unpublished, and a large proportion has been discovered since 1840. He brought his collection of drawings, to the number of 360, to England, and exhibited them to many persons. He wishes to publish the work in Paris, and the French Government has generously promised to take no less than 100 copies at 500f.; the publishing price in England will probably be from 20*l.* to 25*l.*

The drawings are extremely beautiful, and, as we can testify in many instances, quite accurate. The work will be divided into two parts: 219 plates of frescoes and monuments; 141 of a selection of glass paintings, lamps, and inscriptions from museums at Rome; the former will be by far the most important part of the work; we should rather see it published by itself, as in 141 plates, so meagre a collection of the inscriptions will be given, that it will be of little use. Besides, M. Perret is an artist, not a scholar, and therefore his principle of selection is not such a one as is required for a great work on the *inscriptions* of the early Christians.

Correspondence.

POPULAR SERVICES.

To the Editor of the Rambler.

SIR,—I have read with great interest the remarks on Popular Services which occur in your last Number, in the review of Father Faber's three Lectures; and as I have myself experienced the truth of your observation as to "the contrast which too many of our English Catholic churches present to a vast number of the Catholic churches on the continent" in this respect, I am induced to send you a few lines upon the same subject, if you should think them worth inserting in some future Number.

A few years ago, an Anglican clergyman of high standing, who chanced to be on a visit to the city of Naples, was anxious to see something, as he said, of the *working* of the Catholic Church, especially with reference to her public services. A festival of some importance falling on a week-day when his own English chapel was closed, soon gave him the desired opportunity; and in company with one of his brethren, who had been resident in Naples for some time, he set forth to make his observations in the cathedral. Those who have had an opportunity of witnessing the very orderly way in which every thing is conducted there under the watchful eye of the excellent Archbishop, his Eminence the Cardinal Sforza, will not need to be told that our Anglican inquirer found the stalls well filled by a goodly array of canons, and that he enjoyed the treat of hearing the Divine Office very correctly chanted by a number of priests, of ecclesiastical students, and of other more juvenile choristers. But there were scarcely a dozen persons in the church

who seemed to be paying any attention to what was going on, so that the Anglican stranger, as he left the building, rather triumphantly observed, "Ah, it is just as I supposed, the clergy are going one way and the people another, because they *will* have their services in Latin." His friend, who knew somewhat more of the real state of things (*plus sapuit quam oportet sapere*, I fear), made no reply, but only led him on to another church at no great distance, and desired him to go in. Scarcely had he crossed the threshold, before he turned round and declared his inability to proceed, the atmosphere was so intolerable. "Oh, go on; get further in, nearer to the high altar, there will be more space there," said his guide, who had maliciously planted himself behind, so as to cut off the possibility of a retreat. This advice, however, it was easier to give than to follow; no efforts could succeed in penetrating far through that dense mass of people; still he advanced a little, far enough to discern a tall thin figure swaying to and fro in the pulpit, and to hear the weak tones of an impassioned voice delivering some earnest practical exhortation to a most eager and attentive audience. Presently, the voice of the frail old man gave way, and he bade his listeners give him a little relief by singing a verse of a hymn. And now our Anglican friend was fairly beaten out of the field; if his olfactory nerves had been somewhat offended upon his first entrance into the church, he now felt as if his very head would split under the action of that tremendous roar of voices which instantly rose up around him in some popular cantique, some hymn in honour of the Adorable Sacrament or of our Blessed Lady, or whatever else it may chance to have been. As soon as he could effect his escape into the open air, he found that his views upon the separation of the clergy from the people in matters of religion had been considerably modified during his short visit to the Gesù Vecchio at Naples.

Now it is not, of course, to be expected that every parish priest, either in England or elsewhere, should be a Don Placido; but neither do I think that the scene I have been describing really depended in any way upon the personal influence or the eloquence of that remarkable preacher; I have seen the same *kind* of thing, though not perhaps to the same degree, in places where there has certainly been no similar source of attraction. On the other hand, I have never seen any thing at all like it in the singing of Vespers or Compline; nothing half so popular, so congregational. I have heard these most beautiful portions of the Divine Office sung in the most unexceptionable manner by canons, or monks, or friars, or professional choirs, and it has often been a great treat to listen to them; and I have also heard them sung in a most excruciating manner through the inability of the performers; but I certainly never heard them sung at all generally by a congregation. There has often been a congregation present, but they have either silently listened to the music for awhile, then taken a stroll up and down the spacious aisles, and then returned to listen to a little more; or the more orderly and devout have been engaged with some pious book, with their rosary, or some other private devotions, only waiting for the sermon, or the Benediction, or whatever else of a more popular character was intended to follow.

On the other hand, nothing can be more striking than the congregational character of some of the afternoon and evening devotions, in which the people *do* take part. First, there is the Rosary in very common use, and sometimes so entirely popular in its mode of recital that I have heard it in small country places (where there has been but a single priest perhaps belonging to the parish) conducted by a poor congrega-

tion that had not one educated person amongst them, without the presence of any ecclesiastic whatever. Ordinary night-prayers, again, are not uncommonly the public devotions of the evening in places where the congregation is chiefly made up of the poorer classes; but these prayers are not merely read by the priest for the people, each one recites them also aloud for himself, and a pretty Babel it is to the outward ear, though cheering enough to the heart and the understanding. To these is sometimes added, by way of appendix, some popular hymn, either to the adorable Sacrament of the Altar or to the Blessed Mother of God; and here, again, the priest often leaves the people entirely to themselves; he is gone into the sacristy, after giving Benediction, all the lights upon the altar are extinguished, but still the congregation continue their hymn, often for a very considerable time, either all singing together, or those who happen to be on the opposite sides of the church singing the alternate verses, of course without any musical accompaniment.

Another exceedingly common devotion for the evening in the churches of central and southern Italy (for it is only of this part of Catholic Europe that I am speaking) is to be found in the frequent Novenas before all the Feasts of our Lord, of our Blessed Lady, and of the principal Saints, and again in their octaves, and these generally consist of a number of prayers recited by the priest, to which the people unite their intentions in several Our Fathers and Hail Marys repeated between every prayer. The same account also is to be given of the exercises of numerous congregations and confraternities, which, as they exist in Catholic countries, often supply the framework of the afternoon or evening functions; such as the Congregation of the *Bona Mors*, for example, which I am induced to specify rather than any other, only because of its more general character, and the universal sympathy which naturally attaches to its object.

A few prayers of this kind, then, together with a sermon, the Litany of Loretto, and Benediction, constitute the ordinary public function of a Sunday afternoon or evening in those countries which I have mentioned, and an exceedingly popular one it is. In most places its popularity is greatly enhanced also by the peculiar character of the sermon, or, as in some places, of the catechising. The public catechism, conducted by the Jesuits in their *Missione Urbana* every Sunday afternoon in one or other of the principal churches of Rome, is familiar to all who have studied the religious habits of that city, and some account of it has been given to your readers in a former volume;* this is only an extreme instance of what I mean, the same kind of popular colloquial character belongs to the evening functions in many of the most interesting Italian churches. In the Chiaja of Naples is a little chapel, dedicated to Santa Maria della Luce, frequented almost exclusively by fishermen, and served by three priests, brothers, and themselves also sons of a fisherman. Go in there on a Sunday evening, or indeed almost on any evening of the week, and if you are not too much inconvenienced by the closeness of the atmosphere around you, you will enjoy a most curious and edifying spectacle. A number of rough, weather-beaten, bare-legged mariners, sitting or standing with open mouth and eyes, listening to a very plain-spoken priest, who stands in a pulpit but slightly raised above the level of his congregation, and who is preaching, or rather I should say, is talking to them, about prayer. He has just been laying down some practical rules for the better avoidance of distractions in prayer, when suddenly one of his simple audience looks

* See also vol. i. p. 375.

up at him, and says, "But, father, the devil is too strong for me; distractions *will* come;" whereupon a regular conversation ensues between the priest and the fisherman, in which perhaps two or three others also from different parts of the chapel presently take part. However, I must not allow myself to be carried away by the pleasant recollection of these scenes into a digression that would lead far from the subject before us, nor would I for a moment be understood as implying that the usages of Rome or Naples either could or should be literally transplanted into England; it may be that they are not suited to the thoughts, tastes, or dispositions of English Catholics, or even to the capabilities of our national character. I have only spoken of them here that you may understand how *extremely* popular and congregational many of the foreign devotions are, and what a striking contrast they present to the ordinary character of those in our own churches. I say the *ordinary* character, for I believe that there are numerous exceptions, more numerous perhaps than would seem to be implied by the language of the article in your last Number to which I have referred. It would not only be difficult to find an Italian congregation, the majority of which did not join in voice as well as in heart in the Litany of Loretto and in the hymns at Benediction, it would be simply impossible to find such a phenomenon, excepting on extraordinary occasions, when, by way of doing honour to some high festival, the choir has been allowed to indulge in the performance of some new and elaborate tune, too difficult to follow; and even then the voices of the people would pretty certainly struggle through the attempt to silence them, and insist upon being heard at least in the *Ora pro nobis*, even if the composer had not prudently provided this as a convenient outlet for their zeal. The *Tantum ergo*, as sung by a Roman congregation, is a thing to remember and be thankful for all one's days; not for its harmony, but as the most fervent outpouring of human devotion which one can hope to witness on this side the grave. A Protestant clergyman has recorded his own amazement, and that of other English Protestants, his friends, at the religious services of the Jesuits' church of Naples, how "they were quite startled by the first response of that five thousand in prayer," how "it is impossible to forget the fulness and the earnestness of the *one voice* of that congregation, the voice of thousands, and yet one it would seem in heart, and one almost in sound." It is indeed a wonderful scene, not only to Protestants, but even to English Catholics, accustomed only to "the decorous silence of their frigid countrymen:" yet in Italy it is not a scene peculiar to the Jesuits' churches, excepting only in as far as their churches are larger and better filled perhaps than many others; but the very same thing is to be heard—the same in kind, only necessarily inferior in degree—not only in the churches of towns and cities, but even of villages and hamlets.

Let us hope that one day the devotion which lurks in the heart of the English Catholic full as deeply, I am sure, as in that of the Italian, may break through the trammels of English *mauvaise honte*, and burst forth in a flood of fervent song, as intense and heart-stirring, if not more harmonious.—Yours, &c.

M. N. H.

Ecclesiastical Register.

ELEVATION OF DR. WISEMAN TO THE CARDINALATE.— THE ENGLISH HIERARCHY.

ON the 30th of September the long-anticipated event, pregnant with momentous consequences to this nation, and through England to the world, took place in Rome. His Holiness proclaimed the following Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church:

OF THE ORDER OF PRIESTS.

Mgr. *Raphael Fornari*, Archbishop of Nicæa, Nuncio-Apostolic to the French Republic, born at Rome on Jan. 23, 1787; reserved, *in petto*, at the Secret Consistory of Dec. 21st, 1846.

Mgr. *Paul-Theresa-David d'Astros*, Archbishop of Toulouse, in France, born at Tours Oct. 13th, 1772.

Mgr. *John-Joseph Bonnel y Orbo*, Archbishop of Toledo, in Spain, born at Pinos della Valle, in the archbishopric of Grenada, March 17th, 1782.

Mgr. *Joseph Cosenza*, Archbishop of Capua, in the kingdom of the Two Sicilies, born at Naples Feb. 20th, 1788, transferred from the Episcopal Church of Andria.

Mgr. *Jacques-Maria-Adrien-César Mathieu*, Archbishop of Besançon, in France, born at Paris Jan. 20th, 1796.

Mgr. *Jude-Joseph Romo*, Archbishop of Seville, in Andalusia, in Spain, born at Cavixar, in the archbishopric of Toledo, Jan. 9th, 1779.

Mgr. *Thomas Gousset*, Archbishop of Rheims, in France, born at Montigny-les-Cherlieux, in the archbishopric of Besançon, May 1st, 1792.

Mgr. *Maximilian-Joseph-Godfrey*, Baron de Semeranbeek, Archbishop of Olmutz, in Moravia, born at Vienna Dec. 21st, 1796.

Mgr. *John Geissel*, Archbishop of Cologne, in the states of the King of Prussia, in Germany, born at Giammeldingen, in the diocese of Spire, Feb. 4th, 1796.

Mgr. *Peter-Paul de Figueredo de Cunha e Mello*, Archbishop of Braga, in Portugal, born at Faveiro, in the diocese of Coimbra, June 19th, 1770.

Mgr. *Nicholas Wiseman*, Archbishop of Westminster, in England, a Metropolitan Church recently erected by his Holiness, transferred from the Church of Melipotamus *in partibus*, Vicar-Apostolic of the District of London, born at Seville August 2d, 1802.

Mgr. *Joseph Pecci*, Bishop of Gubio, born at Gubio April 13th, 1776.

Mgr. *Melchior de Diepenbrock*, Bishop of Breslau, in Silesia, born at Bochald, in the diocese of Munster, Jan. 9th, 1798.

OF THE ORDER OF DEACONS.

Mgr. *Roberto Roberti*, Auditor-General of the Rota, Apostolic Chamber, born at St. Giusto, in the diocese of Fermo, Dec. 23d, 1788.

The following details are taken from Roman letters in the *Univers*, the *Ami de la Religion*, and the *Times*:

"On the 29th of September, St. Michael's day, the Holy Father visited the Hospital of St. Michael; and after having heard Mass in the church of that establishment, his Holiness promulgated, in a hall that had been arranged for the ceremony, two decrees of the Congregation of Rites. The first recognised the heroicity of the virtues of the Venerable Servant of God Angela-Maria Astorch, a Spanish Capuchin Nun; the second declared that the beatification might be proceeded with of

the Venerable Maria Anna de Jesus de Paredes, Virgin, of Peru, called the Lily of Quito. The Society of Jesus are conducting this cause, and defray the expenses of it. The beatification of the last-mentioned servant of God is likely to take place next May, as also that of the Venerable Peter Claver. The postulators of these two causes addressed, as usual, a few words expressive of their gratitude to his Holiness, to which the Holy Father graciously replied. The Pope then inspected the Hospital of St. Michael, attended by Cardinal Torti and other distinguished personages, amongst whom was General Gemeau.

On the 30th a Secret Consistory was held at the Vatican, at which were preconised twelve new Archbishops and Bishops, and fourteen illustrious Prelates were raised to the dignity of the Cardinalate. After the consistory was over, three messengers were sent to announce the intelligence to each of the four Cardinals at present in Rome, and other messengers were to start in the course of a few hours to convey the news of their promotion to the Cardinals residing in foreign countries. These messengers are chosen from among the noble guards of the Pope, and are followed by young prelates, whose mission to the new Cardinals is of a more formal character. The new Cardinals will afterwards be appointed members of several of the congregations which assist the Holy Father in the government of the Church.

The *Times* correspondent comments as follows on the nominations :

“The consistory of this day is one of the most remarkable in modern times, from the circumstance of ten out of the fourteen Cardinals having been chosen from foreign states, and only four of them being Italians. The principle on which the selection of the new Cardinals has been made is the same that has guided the Pope in other instances, especially in the nomination of his foreign *camerieri segreti partecipanti*. It has long been admitted in theory, that the Papacy is not merely an Italian, but a European, or to speak more properly, a universal power. Its Italian character, however, has generally so far preponderated as to make the superficial observer overlook its more extended relations. A petty Italian state, governed by Italians, with little or no influence on countries at a distance, while they in their turn felt little interest in it,—such is the idea of the Papacy which has been most familiar to men’s minds. Individual Catholics from one pole to the other bowed down in submissive respect before its authority, but nations and governments collectively seemed to regard it with indifference. Its recent disasters have produced for it one advantage, they have shewn that its importance is not to be measured by the few square miles of its territory, or by the small numbers of its population. All the powers of the Old and New World have felt, spoken, and acted towards it in a way which would be ridiculous if they regarded only its size or its physical resources ; and for the first time in history, the combined action of some of the principal nations in Europe have replaced the Pope on the oldest throne in the world. Thus has been effected what in some sense may be called the ‘rehabilitation’ of the Papacy as more than an Italian state ; and Pius IX., following out the idea, has looked beyond Italy for counsellors, and called to the honour of the purple a greater portion of foreign Cardinals than former precedents in the last three hundred years would have authorised.

“As soon as Dr. Wiseman received the notice of his elevation, he placed himself, according to the usages, upon the threshold of one of the state rooms at the Palace of the Consulate, where his reception took place, to receive the congratulations of the Cardinals and Ambassadors, who sent their attendants for the purpose. The visit, styled from its hurry the *visita di calire*, occupied two or three hours. This afternoon each of the new Cardinals will proceed, with the blinds drawn, to the

Vatican, where his Holiness will give them the red *beretta*, or cap, after which Cardinal Wiseman, in the name of the others, will return thanks, standing, for the honour bestowed upon his colleagues and himself. As they leave the Pope's apartment they will receive from an attendant the red *zucchotto*, or skull-cap. They will afterwards go home with the carriage darkened as before, and during the next three days they must remain always at home. This evening the Cardinals, Ambassadors, and nobility, Roman and foreign, present their congratulations in person to each of the new Cardinals. M. Martinez de la Rosa, Ambassador of Spain, was to hold a grand reception at the palace of the Spanish embassy. The Bishops of Andria and Gubio reside in the House of the Theatines, at St. Andrea della Valle, and ladies will not be able to attend their reception; but the Cardinals who reside in the city usually request one of their own family, or some lady of rank, to receive the princesses and other ladies who may wish to be presented on the occasion. Our countrywoman, the Princess Doria, will do the honours for Cardinal Wiseman, and the Princess Massimo will receive for Cardinal Roberti. On these occasions there is generally a grand display of the diamonds of the noble Roman families, and curiosity is attracted by the brilliant jewels of the Torlonias, and the splendid heirlooms of the Doria, Borghese, Ruspigiosi, and others.

“On the mornings of Tuesday and Wednesday the Roman Princes will visit the new Cardinals in state, the rule being that no two Princes be present at the same time, in order that the rank and precedence which etiquette obliges them to respect may be duly preserved. The Generals of the Religious Orders will likewise attend to offer their respects. The great ceremonies, however, are reserved for Thursday morning. At an early hour the new Cardinals take the oaths in the Sistine Chapel, whilst the other Cardinals assemble in the Sala Ducale, or Hall of the Consistories, near the chapel. The new Cardinals are introduced, and, kneeling, receive the red hat from the Pope, with an admonition that its colour is to remind them that they are to be ready to shed their blood, if necessary, for the Church. They are then embraced by their colleagues, and take their places among them. The *Te Deum* is afterwards sung, whilst the new Cardinals are prostrate on the floor. At this public consistory all may be present; but a secret consistory is afterwards held, in which the Pope declares the mouths of the new Cardinals closed, so that they are incapable of voting upon matters appertaining to the judgment of their colleagues, until by another act at the end of the consistory, their mouths are declared to be opened. Between the closing and opening a considerable time may elapse, during which the candidates can vote for the election of a new Pope in conclave only. At this secret consistory each Cardinal receives a sapphire ring, for which he pays 500 crowns, for the benefit of the missions to Asia, China, and other countries, and a title or church is assigned to him. I believe that the Cardinal Wiseman will receive the title of St. Pudentiana, who is stated by ancient authors to have been a granddaughter of the celebrated British chieftain Caractacus, and whose church is said to contain memorials of the earliest days of the preaching of Christianity in Rome. In the afternoon of the same day the new Cardinals will visit St. Peter's in state, followed by the carriages of their colleagues and other personages. In the evening a curious ceremony will close the solemnities of their promotion. The keeper of his Holiness's wardrobe will bring the red hat, which was placed on his head in the morning, to each of the Cardinals, who will receive it in full costume, standing near the throne erected for the Pope in every Cardinal's residence. Complimentary addresses are made by

the keeper and by the Cardinal, who then retires, puts on a simpler dress, and returns to attend his visitors. Refreshments are handed round, and at a suitable hour they retire, and all is over."

The arrangements for the English hierarchy are said to be as follows:—
There are to be thirteen Bishops instead of eight Vicars-Apostolic.

The Archbishop of Westminster (for Middlesex, Essex, Herts).

Bishop of Southwark (for Surrey, Kent, Sussex, Hants).

„ Plymouth (for Cornwall, Devonshire, Dorset).

„ Clifton (for Somersetshire, Gloucestershire, Wilts).

„ Newport and St. David's (South Wales, Monmouthshire, Herefordshire).

„ Shrewsbury (Cheshire, Salop, North Wales).

„ Birmingham (Staffordshire, Berks, Warwickshire, Worcestershire, Oxon).

„ Nottingham (Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire, Lincolnshire, Leicestershire, Bucks, Beds, Rutland).

„ Northampton (Northamptonshire, Norfolk, Suffolk, Huntingdonshire, Cambridgeshire).

„ Beverley (Yorkshire).

„ Salford (Lancashire, Eastern Division).

„ Liverpool (Lancashire, Western Division).

„ Hexham (Northumberland, Cumberland, Westmoreland, Durham).

The *Univers* has the following :

"All the English Catholics residing at Rome have been desirous of testifying their gratitude to the Holy Father for the great act by which the Supreme Pontiff has re established in England the Episcopal Hierarchy, and which alone would be sufficient to immortalise a Pontificate. On Sunday, the 6th inst., Cardinal Wiseman himself presented to his Holiness these generous Christians, amongst whom are a great number of converts. All the members of the English College, conducted by their respected rector, Dr. Grant, united in the deputation, which was received by the Supreme Pontiff not merely with kindness, but with real joy. Having expressed his satisfaction at having been able to accomplish this important project, he thus continued, in the presence of Cardinal Wiseman :

"I had not intended sending the new Cardinal back into England ; I had thought of retaining him near my own person, and of profiting by his counsels. But I perceived that the proper moment was come for executing the great enterprise for which you have come to return me thanks. I do not think there will be any thing to apprehend in consequence. I spoke of it at the time to Lord Minto, and I understood that the English Government would not oppose the execution of my design. I send back, therefore, into England the eminent Cardinal, and I invite you all to pray unceasingly, that the Lord will remove all difficulties, and that He will lead into the new Church a million—three millions of your fellow-countrymen, still separated from us, to the end that he may cause them all to enter, even to the last man."

"This is the purport of the words of the Supreme Pontiff as our correspondent has been able to gather them from the lips of one of the happy witnesses of that scene. The Cardinal replied that there was nothing to be feared on the part of the English Government, and that he hoped that Providence would grant success to a project upon which depends the religious destinies of England. The deputation retired, carrying away with them the most affectionate and paternal blessing of the Vicar of Jesus Christ."

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY FOR IRELAND.

THE following Archbishops and Bishops, two from each of the four provinces, were appointed by the Synod of Thurles as a permanent Committee for carrying into execution the important project of establishing a Catholic University in Ireland, with power to name as members of the Committee one clergyman and one layman each: the Most Rev. Dr. Cullen, the Most Rev. Dr. Murray, the Most Rev. Dr. Slattery, the Most Rev. Dr. M'Hale, the Right Rev. Dr. Cantwell, the Right Rev. Dr. Haly, the Right Rev. Dr. Foran, the Right Rev. Dr. Derry. The Rev. Patrick Leahy, President of the College of Thurles, was appointed secretary to the Committee.

At the first meeting of the Prelates forming the committee, the following clergymen were appointed members of the committee: the Rev. P. Cooper, Dublin; the Very Rev. Dean Meyler, Dublin; the Rev. P. Leahy, President of the College of Thurles; the Rev. D. O'Brien, President of the College of Waterford; the Rev. Dr. O'Hanlon, Maynooth College; the Rev. James Maher, P.P., Graigue, Carlow; the Rev. Mr. Brennan, P.P., Kildare.

The eight above-mentioned Prelates have issued a most important address to the Catholics of Ireland, from which we take the following paragraphs:

"In a highly artificial state of society, such as we live in, secular education of a high order is a thing of absolute necessity, whether to the professional man, or the merchant, or the private gentleman, none of whom can maintain his position in society, much less take a lead in the career of honourable competition, unless his natural talents have been previously formed to the pursuits of life by the hand of education. Hence, to promote the cause of learning, and with that view to create educational institutions suited to the exigences of society, must be deemed an object of paramount importance. Fully impressed with this conviction, the Catholic Bishops of Ireland deem it a duty incumbent on them, to the utmost of their power, influence, and means, to provide for the Catholic youth of Ireland education of a high order, every way commensurate with the intellectual wants of the time; and we, in their name, earnestly exhort you, the people of Ireland, the interest of whose children and children's children are at stake, to co-operate heart and soul according to your respective abilities in forwarding this great national undertaking. But its strongest recommendation to you is, its bearing on the interests of the Catholic religion for generations to come; for the grand object in view is to make the Catholic religion the basis of a system of academical education as extensive and diversified as any to be found in the most distinguished universities of Europe, so that the youth of the country may enjoy all the benefits of the highest education without any detriment to their faith or morals.

"Without undervaluing secular learning, or overrating the importance of religion, is it not of the utmost consequence that the education of our youth be Catholic? One of the greatest calamities of modern times is the separation of religion from science; whereas the perfection of knowledge is the union of both, which produces the most perfect form of civilised society, by making men not only learned, but also good Christians. So far from there being any antagonism between religion and science, they are a mutual advantage, each reflecting light upon and facilitating the acquisition of the other. Why, then, should they be separated in the education of youth? Is it not preposterous to instruct in every

species of knowledge save that which alone is necessary—the knowledge of religion—in comparison with which the science of Newton fades away into insignificance? ‘Better is an humble rustic who serves God, than a proud philosopher who neglects himself while he considers the course of the heavens.’ ‘What doth it profit a man to know the whole world and lose his own soul?’ And lose it he may, if he launches out on the wide sea of speculation without the polar star of religion to guide his course. Sacred Scripture testifies that the ‘knowledge’ of this world ‘puffeth up’* with pride—intellectual pride—which is the forerunner of a fall, for ‘God resisteth the proud, and giveth grace to the humble.’† And at what period of the world’s history have men of science gone so much astray after the devices of their own imagination as at the present time, when we behold the sciences claimed for their own by men unjustly assuming the name of philosophers, whose wild theories are as inconsistent with all sound philosophy as their social, or rather anti-social, principles are subversive of all order? From science without religion has sprung that spurious philosophy which has overrun so many of the schools and colleges and universities of the continent of Europe, and which the professors of Atheism, Pantheism, and every form of unbelief, make the groundwork of their impious system. The youth of Ireland shall, with God’s blessing, be saved from the taint of this mischievous philosophy by a thoroughly Catholic education. And this is one of the grand objects of a Catholic University.

“Besides the detriment to the faith and morals of individuals, the separation of religion from secular education is fraught with danger to society at large. If you reduce to a general system the principle of separating religious from secular education, at no distant day anarchy will be the result; for religion is a necessary supplement to law and authority; where its salutary restraints are wanting, these latter will not be able to enforce obedience or preserve order; they will be overthrown by the violence which they attempt in vain to control, and society will fall back into a state of chaos.

“This is what in the nature of things must happen whenever religion is systematically excluded from public education, as it has happened in our own time. Witness the first French Revolution, the master-spirits in which proscribed religion from the public schools, well knowing that every effort to revolutionise the mind of France would prove abortive so long as the Catholic Church presided over the education of the country. The horrors that ensued, filling as they do one of the blackest pages in history, afforded a terrible lesson to all the nations of the earth on the dangers of science without religion, and on the infatuation of the policy that would in an evil hour separate by an unholy divorce what the one divine Author of Truth had united by an indissoluble bond. It was only the other day that Providence, in its mercy, saved the nations of Europe from similar calamities arising from the same cause. In the revolutions which recently agitated the Continent, who were every where the apostles of rebellion, the standard-bearers of anarchy? Were they not students of the colleges and universities, in which, according to the modern fashion, every thing is taught but religion? in which the place and function of religion are usurped by a philosophy that saps the foundations of true faith, corrupts the morals of youth, and sends them forth into society to become the most active fomenters of every mischief. God forbid that so baneful a system should ever take root in our country. Should the sovereign of these realms ever have to invoke the loyalty of the well-

* 1 Cor. viii.

† James iv. 6.

disposed against the designs of turbulent men, the youth brought up in a Catholic University would be found in the front rank of the defenders of order; and hence, the British statesman who would surround the throne with devoted subjects, and give to society good citizens, must, on the ground at least of a wise state-policy, sincerely desire to see the youth of Ireland brought up according to the strict principles of the Catholic faith.

“But more is required to complete a Catholic education. As it is a capital article of our belief that faith alone will not suffice for salvation, but must be accompanied by the works of practical morality, it follows that a sound Catholic education must be moral as well as dogmatic—not stopping short with teaching the principles of faith, but also training up youth by a course of exact moral discipline, and habituating them to the observations of Catholic piety; and this union it is of dogmatic and moral instruction which forms the perfect moral character, by teaching us to render to our Sovereign Maker the homage of the two great faculties of our nature—of the understanding which becomes captive to his unerring word, and of the will which bends to his high commands. It is so the Catholic Church has ever taught her children. The lives of her saints, the writings of her doctors, the statutes of her synods, the constitutions of her religious societies, the education imparted in her schools, colleges, and universities,—all testify that the Catholic Church is not content to promote the study of letters without also sanctifying it by the influence of religion; and that she looks upon the work of education as only half done unless diligent moral culture and practical piety proceed *pari passu* with intellectual improvement. This thoroughly Catholic education will be carried out in all its details in our proposed Catholic University.

“Besides the conservative influence, so to call it, of religion, a Catholic University would also impart a higher tone to the Catholic body; it would diffuse Catholic notions through the mass of society; it would create a greater interest in all that concerns the welfare of the Catholic religion; it would diffuse a taste for Catholic literature, Catholic arts, Catholic institutions of every sort; it would create a large body of learned men, who would exercise an important influence on society,—men competent, on the one hand, to vindicate the cause of religion against the insidious attacks of a mis-called but dangerous science, and, on the other, to rescue science from the use to which it has been perverted, by dissociating it from, and even turning it against, religion; it would educate every one to that lofty Catholic principle, that religion is a consideration paramount to every other, and therefore never to be compromised in order to purchase any temporal advantage whatever: in these, and many ways besides, a Catholic University would serve as a grand centre for diffusing the living principle of faith through the whole Catholic body, and communicating its vivifying influence to the most distant and least important parts.

“We are a Catholic people. As such, ought we not have a great Catholic institution, in which the aspiring youth of the country may enjoy all the advantages of a superior university education, and at the same time be imbued with a thoroughly Catholic spirit? Many of them being destined to be our future magistrates, lawyers, statesmen, it is of great importance, in an age distinguished for judicial, forensic, and senatorial talent, to provide every facility for the development of Catholic genius; but it is of immeasurably greater importance that our rising youth, the hope of the country, shall be, not bigots, but enlightened Catholics; not Catholics in name, but in truth and in deed, in

principle and in action; not men of expediency, ever ready to sacrifice the dearest interests of religion to the necessities of state-policy, but men who would not compromise one iota of religion or its interests to gain the whole world,—men, in a word, formed on the model of that distinguished nobleman in a neighbouring country, whose strong attachment to his faith makes him the glory of the Catholic world, inspires him with the loftiest sentiments, and imparts its greatest brilliancy to his truly splendid eloquence. Give us a generation of such men, and the face of things will be renewed in Ireland. Give us a Catholic University, and you will have such men.

“The project of a Catholic University is met with objections from two classes of persons—one mostly Protestant, the other Catholic. Our Protestant brethren ought not, surely, to take it ill that we desire to establish a Catholic University. Whilst they may be said to have Trinity College for themselves, and have also a gorgeous Church-establishment, supported by the Catholics of Ireland, they cannot complain if, having done so much to maintain the temporal state of Protestantism, the Catholics of Ireland out of their limited resources make the attempt to erect a great literary institution which shall be all out Catholic, at the same time that it meets the intellectual demands of the country. Ought not such an effort to elicit the applause, if it did not command the support, of every liberal Protestant, were it only that, for the honour of the British empire, we should no longer be the only Catholic people in Europe without a Catholic University?

“The project of a Catholic University, it may be said, is conceived in a spirit of narrow-minded bigotry, and opposed to the cultivation of that good feeling between the members of different religious creeds so desirable in a country long divided by contending religious parties. Professing ourselves second to none in our desire to cultivate peace and amity with all men, we assert, nor can it offend any one to assert, that the Catholics of Ireland, throughout their religious struggle, have been acting on the defensive, striving to regain the just rights of which they had been deprived, or resisting new aggressions upon the remnant still left them. We maintain that the Catholics, who are emphatically the people of Ireland, are as clearly entitled, without incurring the charge of bigoted exclusiveness, to have an exclusively Catholic University as to profess the Catholic faith, and it alone, and without any admixture, or to adore God in churches exclusively devoted to Catholic worship. We fear that any attempt to fuse down all religions into one mass would result in an indifferentism more fatal to the interests of true religion, and more dangerous to society, than the most violent religious contentions. And then, as to the cultivation of kindly feeling between man and man, we believe that the Catholic who is brought up strictly according to the tenets of his own Church will in all the relations of life be incomparably a better man than one who is not so brought up,—more obedient as a subject, more useful as a citizen, more exact in observing all the charities of life towards those who profess a different religion.

“Some few Catholics object against the project of a Catholic University, because in the present circumstances of the country they fear it is an impossibility. No doubt the difficulties are great, but the project is by no means an impossibility. No great work was ever undertaken that was not attended with difficulties, which the timid and weak-hearted are every ready to magnify into impossibilities. However, while they are speculating, and doubting, and holding back, all difficulties disappear before energy and perseverance, and the work is done. What the isolated efforts of individuals cannot accomplish, becomes easy by union;

and the most astonishing results, as we see every day, are accomplished by Catholic faith combining together all hearts and sentiments and views, and directing them to the attainment of one common object. We trust in the faith of Ireland. With the blessing of Divine Providence, it is able to surmount the difficulties, whatever they may be, that stand in the way of a Catholic University.

“Relying on so many grave considerations, we, in the name of the Bishops assembled in the great National Synod, call upon you, the Catholic clergy and people of Ireland, to throw yourselves heart and soul into this great work, and to assist, according to your means, in carrying it into immediate execution. And if you will exhibit the respect of dutiful children to the expressed wishes of the common Father of the Faithful,—if you will hearken with docility to the united voices of your chief pastors, issuing from a Council as august as any that was ever held in our national Church,—if, for the first time in the annals of our history, you, the people of Ireland, will not sever yourselves from a clergy that in every vicissitude of fortune remained faithful to you,—if you wish that the youth of Ireland shall not be led astray by the science of this world, ‘which puffeth up’ with pride, corrupts the heart, unsettles the faith, disturbs society, and overturns the throne and the altar, but that they shall be imbued with science, ‘the beginning’ of which ‘is the fear of the Lord,’ and its end peace, order, obedience, happiness, both spiritual and temporal,—if you wish to hand down to future generations that Catholic faith for which we have suffered so much, and which is the first principle of civilisation,—then will this appeal not have been made in vain—then we shall have the happiness to see you, the Catholic clergy and people of Ireland, united as one man in carrying out a work that will do honour to your enlightened and patriotic zeal, and prove to the world the enduring strength of Ireland’s faith. And this, we anticipate, will, with God’s blessing, be the result of our appeal.”

NEW CATHOLIC CHURCHES.—New churches, all structures worthy of their sacred purpose, have been opened during the last month at Yarmouth, in the county of Norfolk; at Thorneley, in the county of Durham; and at Cork.

THE CONGREGATION OF THE PASSIONISTS.—The Rev. Father Ignatius, Vice-Provincial of the English Passionists, is preaching with wonderful success on the conversion of England in many parts of Ireland, where he receives the warmest welcome. He is also collecting offerings for a church and monastery at the Hyde, Edgeware Road, London, where land has recently been purchased. The Passionist Fathers have just been removed from the mission, a most prosperous one, which they have for some years served at Woodchester, Gloucestershire, their departures being equally regretted by themselves and by the Catholics of the neighbourhood. Some of the Fathers have gone to Broadway, Worcestershire, where a monastery, with land adjoining, has been placed in their hands by the Benedictines on the most liberal terms, and where they will continue the same missionary labours which have been blessed with such striking results at Woodchester. The house being convenient, and the situation healthy, the Passionist Noviciate will be removed to Broadway, from Aston, after Christmas next. The late Superior of Woodchester, the Rev. Father Vincent, is to be settled at Broadway; and the Vice-Superior, the Rev. Father Honorias, at the Passionist Monastery at the Hyde, Edgeware Road.

The Rambler.

PART XXXVI.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
THE HIERARCHY	467
RELIGION AND MODERN PHILOSOPHY : No. IV. The Religion of the Modern Philosopher	480
COLLECTIONS ILLUSTRATING THE HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH BENEDICTINE CONGREGATION	491
REVIEW :—RISE, PROGRESS, AND RESULTS OF PUSEYISM.— Lectures on certain Difficulties felt by Anglicans in sub- mitting to the Catholic Church ; by John Henry Newman, Priest of the Oratory of St. Philip Neri	506
ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER.—Apostolical Letter of our Most Holy Father Pope Pius the Ninth, re-establishing the Ca- tholic Hierarchy in England, with a translation—Pastoral Letter of Cardinal Wiseman to the Clergy and Faithful of the Archdiocese of London and Diocese of Southwark— New Church and Mission at Gateshead	544
TO CORRESPONDENTS : Popular Services	560

To Correspondents.

Correspondents who require answers in private are requested to send their complete address, a precaution not always observed.

We cannot undertake to return rejected communications.

All communications must be *postpaid*. Communications respecting *Advertisements* must be addressed to the publishers, Messrs. BURNS and LAMBERT.

"J. M. C." declined, with thanks.